

Theodoros K. Gkourogiannis

PINDARIC QUOTATIONS IN AELIUS ARISTIDES

Submitted to the University College London
for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)

1999



ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the quotations from Pindar in the orations of Aelius Aristides. Aristides holds an important place among Imperial age writers, exemplifying in their finest the prominent trends of the age of the Second Sophistic: through his Atticistic prose and archaistic tendencies, his impressively erudite grasp of Greek literature of the past and an elevated Isocratean view of the orator's educational and moral duties, all of which are revealed in the abundance of carefully selected passages from the classical literature, Pindar being among his most preferred classical authors.

Aristides quotes extensively from Pindar, being one of our most important sources of quotations from the lyric poet, contributing much to our knowledge of Pindar's work otherwise lost. His exemplar antedates the archetype of the Byzantine Mss tradition, giving his testimony ancient authority and offering important insights into the state of the Pindaric text before the selection made in the late second century AD. He not only quotes verbatim expressions or verses from Pindar, but also selects words and paraphrases verses and passages.

This thesis shows that he is often working from an original copy of Pindar and that he is also drawing on ancient *ὑπομνήματα* and a variety of other sources. It examines various aspects of Aristides' quotations from classical authors, and the principles and techniques according to which he quotes Pindar. I have also tried to define the nature of the possible sources from which Aristides quotes Pindar: original edition, paraphrase, anthologies, *ὑπομνήματα*, etc.

The main body of the thesis takes the form of comparative discussions of Pindaric quotations cited in Aristides' orations. They illustrate Aristides' habits of adapting Pindar's words to both the style and the purpose of his own orations. In those quotations for which we have Mss and papyrological support it is obvious that Aristides often recasts Pindar's text in order to meet some part of his rhetorical agenda or to suit his idiom.

He quotes Pindar for ornamental and for argumentative reasons. His frequent allusions to Pindaric odes serve the yearning of the Imperial authors to show true Greek παιδεία, of which Pindar was an indispensable part while the well documented affinity between poetry and epideictic rhetoric is clearly manifested. Aristides' encomiastic and hymnal praises (both verse and prose hymns) are modelled on Pindar's elements of hymnal composition. The thesis aims to show that Pindaric quotations serve not only to improve stylistically and to add to the finesse of Aristides' composition but also in a functional way, as an authoritative aid to the rhetorical arguments at hand, not least among which was the 'apologetic' argument for the value and authenticity of rhetoric as an art against the long standing accusations by its eternal rival, philosophy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I must express my deep gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Herwig Maehler. He has given much of his time to reading carefully earlier drafts of the thesis. His suggestions have always been enlightening and his criticisms thought-provoking. Under his guidance the presentation of the arguments has become clearer. I have benefited enormously from his critical acumen and his receptiveness to new ideas.

I would also like to acknowledge my debt to Prof. Richard Janko, who has provided me with valuable comments and suggestions on a wide variety of topics pertaining to the thesis.

I have greatly profited from the stimulating discussions with the Professors P.E. Easterling and Chris Carey, whom I thank for their interest in my progress. Throughout this undertaking I have received help, encouragement (and occasionally consolation), from my former teacher at the University of Ioannina, Prof. Ioannes N. Perysinakis. He has introduced me to the subject of Greek lyric poetry, has excited my interest in Pindar, and has always shown a great interest in the progress of my work, being a source of academic inspiration. To Dr Stamatis Mersinias I owe far more than he realises. He has always responded to my requests for advice. I should also like to acknowledge the assistance and friendly advice I have received from former teachers of mine, Prof. K. Constantinides, Prof. Katerina Synodinou, and Ass. Prof. Soteroula Constantinidou. Mr Titos Christodoulou has been immensely helpful in various ways, and I cordially thank him for the benefit I derived from him. Prof. Paul Mertens has kindly provided me with papyrological information on Pindar from his valuable archive, and Dr Stephen Instone commented on an early version. Thanks are also due to Dr Gregory Molivas, Dr Nikolaos Litinas, Mr Athanasios Eustathiou, and Mrs Chryssa Nandris. The architect Mr Euangelos K. Gkourogianis most generously sent me copies of books and photocopies of material stored in Italian Universities.

At the Institute of Classical Studies, London, I was able to enjoy a friendly environment through the kindness and hospitality of the director and the staff of the Library; I want to thank all of them, as well as the Department of Greek and Latin of UCL. I had the privilege of being generously financed by the "*Themistocles and Nikolaos Valsamakis*" foundation (1992-95). I am heavily indebted to the authorities at the above institution.

My greatest debt of gratitude is of a personal kind, and I owe it to my father Konstantinos, to my mother Marigoula and to a special friend Joanna Kika Costas. They have been showing exemplary patience and affection. My father, especially, has shown me his immense and unflagging support, and I dedicate this work to him.

CONTENTS

Abstract	2
Abbreviations	5
Introduction	7
Part A : I. Aelius Aristides and Pindar in the Second Sophistic	
I. Background to the Life and Works of Aelius Aristides	
I.1 Descent - Education	14
I.2 Chronological outline of Aristides' career	14
I.3 The Writings of Aelius Aristides	17
2. Epideictic Oratory and related forms in Aristides' period	20
3. Oratory and Poetry: continuities between archaic lyric poetry and sophistic oratory	24
4. The ' <i>Nachleben</i> ' of Pindar	27
5.1 Aristides' Quotations from Classical Authors	33
5.2 Index of Poets and Authors Quoted by Aristides	35
5.3 The form and the function of Pindaric quotations in Aristides	38
6. Aristides' Sources for his Quotations from Pindar	43
 Part B : Pindaric Quotations [: for each quotation see table, p.10].	 56
Aristides and the Prose-hymns	57
II. Quotations in <i>PRAISE</i> of:	
1. Gods (: religious – hymnal character)	63
2. Individual(s) (: complimentary–laudatory–consolatory)	117
3. Ancient Cities (: complimentary)	138
III. Quotations in support of Aristides' <i>ARGUMENTATIO</i>:	
I. Quotations in Polemic treatises against Plato:	
<i>i. 'In defence of Oratory' (Or. II)</i>	167
<i>ii. 'In defence of the Four' (Or. III)</i>	229
2. Quotations against contemporary '<i>Sophists</i>'	243
3. Quotations: Comparison in terms of '<i>concord</i>' and '<i>beauty</i>'	261
4. Other quotations in support of Aristides' '<i>argumentatio</i>'	279
IV. Quotations for <i>ORNAMENTAL</i> and <i>DECORATIVE</i> purposes	310
V. <i>UNCLASSIFIED</i> Quotation.	330
Conclusions	338
Appendix	
Aristides as a Second Century Intellectual	348
Indices:	
1. '<i>Index of Pindaric quotations</i>'	355
2. 'Distribution of Pindaric quotations in Aristides' orations in chronological order'	358
3. '<i>General Index of quotations in Aristides</i>'	361
Bibliography	367

ABBREVIATIONS *ETC.*

Abbreviations of journals, *etc.*, are based on those used in the annual bibliographical publication, *L'Année philologique*, and other standard works. The following are not otherwise explained in the text, notes, or Bibliography.

AE	<i>L'Année épigraphique</i> , published in <i>Revue Archéologique</i> , (cited by year).
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> , ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, (Berlin - New York, 1972-).
BEFAR	Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d' Athènes et de Rome.
BGU	<i>Berliner griechische Urkunden</i> , (Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen [Staatlichen] Museen zu Berlin), (Berlin, 1895-).
BIFAO	<i>Bulletin de l' Institut Français d' Archéologie Orientale du Caire</i> , (Le Caire, 1901-).
CAF	Th. Kock (ed.), <i>Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta</i> , vols. I-III, (Leipzig, 1880-8).
CGF	G. Kaibel (ed.), <i>Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , (Berlin, 1899).
CIG	A. Boeckh (ed.), <i>Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , (Berlin, 1828-77).
FGrH	F. Jacoby (ed.), <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , (Berlin - Leiden, 1923-58) (repr. 1954-60).
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> , (Berlin, 1873-).
IGRR	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes</i> vols. I, III, and IV edited by R. Cagnat <i>et al.</i> , (Paris, 1906-27).
Kaibel, Epigr. gr.	G. Kaibel (ed.), <i>Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta</i> , (Berlin, 1878).
Kassel-Austin / PCG	R. Kassel - C.F. Austin (eds.), <i>Poetae Comici Graeci</i> , (Berlin - New York, 1983-).
Kleine Pauly	K. Ziegler - W. Sontheimer (eds.), <i>Der kleine Pauly</i> , (Stuttgart, 1964-75).
LIMC	J. Boardman <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae</i> , (Zürich - München, 1981-).
L-P	E. Lobel - D.L. Page, <i>Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta</i> , (Oxford, 1955).
LSJ⁹	H.G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. Stuart Jones (eds.), <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , (Oxford, 1990).
MAMA	<i>Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua</i> , ed. W.M. Calder <i>et al.</i> , (Manchester - London, 1928-).
MPER^{ns}	<i>Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien</i> , Neue Serie, I, ed. H. Gerstinger, H. Oellacher, K. Vogel, (Vienna, 1932), III, (Vienna, 1933).
Nauck² / TGF	A. Nauck (ed.), <i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , (² Leipzig, 1889), repr. with supplement by B. Snell (Hildesheim, 1964).
O'	<i>Old Testament</i> .
OCD	S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), <i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> , (³ Oxford - New York, 1996).
OGIS	W. Dittenberger (ed.), <i>Orientis Graeci Incriptiones Selectae</i> , (Leipzig, 1903-5).
PG	J.P. Migne (ed.), <i>Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca</i> , vols. CLXV, (1857-66).
Paroemiographi Graeci	E.L. von Leutsch - F.G. Schneidewin, <i>Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum</i> , (Göttingae - Hildesheim, 1839-1961).
PIR²	<i>Prosopographia Imperii Romani</i> , Saec. I. II. III., ed. E. Klebs - H. Dessau, (1897-1898); 2nd. edition, E. Groag, - A. Stein, <i>et al.</i> (1933-98), (Academiae Litterarum Borussicae) (² Berolini - Lipsiae).
PLG	T. Bergk (ed.), <i>Poetae Lyrici Graeci</i> , (editionis quartae vol. 1 <i>Pindari carmina continens</i>) (Lipsiae, 1878-82).
PMG	D.L. Page (ed.), <i>Poetae Melici Graeci</i> , (Oxford, 1962) (repr. 1967).

PMGF	M. Davies (ed.), <i>Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> , (Oxford, 1991).
P. Berol.	<i>Berlin Papyri</i> , (cited by inventory number).
P. Oxy.	<i>Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> , ed. B.P. Grenfell - A.S. Hunt <i>et al.</i> , (London, 1898-).
PSI	<i>Papiri Greci e Latini</i> , (Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto), ed. G. Vitelli - M. Norsa <i>et al.</i> , (Florence, 1912-).
RE	A. Pauly - G. Wissowa - W. Kroll - K. Mittelhaus - K. Ziegler (eds.), <i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , (Stuttgart, 1893-1970; Munich, 1972-).
SEG	<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> , (Leiden, 1923-71; Alphen ann den Rijn, 1979-).
SIG³	W. Dittenberger (ed.), <i>Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum</i> , editio tertia, (Leipzig, 1915-24).
Spengel	L. Spengel (ed.), <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> , vols. I-III, (Leipzig, 1852-6); I ii rev. C. Hammer (Leipzig, 1894).
SVF	H. von Arnim, <i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i> , vols. I-III, (Leipzig, 1903-5), vol. IV. Indices comp. Adler, 1924 (repr. Stuttgart 1964).
Walz	C. Walz (ed.), <i>Rhetores Graeci</i> , (9. vol.; Stuttgart, 1832-6, 1 repr. Osnabrück, 1968).
VS	<i>Philostrati Vitae Sophistarum</i> .

<i>ad loc.</i>	<i>ad locum</i>	K.	Keil	<i>Or. / Ors.</i>	<i>Oration(s)</i>
Dind.	Dindorf	L.-B.	Lenz - Behr	<i>Pae.</i>	<i>Paeon</i>
Dith.	<i>Dithyramb</i>	M.	Maehler's edition	<i>Pyth.</i>	<i>Pythian Ode</i>
<i>E.g.</i>	<i>exempli gratia</i>	Ms(s).	Manuscript(s)	<i>sc.</i>	<i>scilicet</i>
<i>Fr(s).</i>	<i>Fragment(s)</i>	<i>Nem.</i>	<i>Nemean Ode</i>	<i>Sn.</i>	<i>Snell</i>
<i>Isth.</i>	<i>Isthmian Ode</i>	<i>Ol.</i>	<i>Olympian Ode</i>	<i>s.v.</i>	<i>sub voce</i>

- Pindar is cited by the text of **H.G.T. Maehler** (Leipzig [Teubner], 1987-89).
- Aristides is cited by the text of **F.W. Lenz†** and **C.A. Behr** (Leiden, 1976-80) for works I-XVI, and by the incomplete edition of **B. Keil** (Berlin, 1898) for works XVII-LIII.
- Internal references from one chapter to another are by page number and footnote number. In many cases the reference is to the text in the vicinity of the footnote.

INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the quotations from Pindar in the orations of Aelius Aristides. Aristides holds an important place in the Imperial age epitomising much of what characterises this period of intellectual flourishing known as the second sophistic: the archaistic tendencies and adherence to the classical models of the past, the Atticist diction and the intellectual confidence of rhetoric as the principal provider of education for the youth, maintaining / transmitting what is Greek, in constant reference to the brilliant models of the fifth century.

Aristides stands out as an important source of Pindaric quotations among his contemporary writers, contributing much to our knowledge of Pindar's work. He not only quotes verbatim expressions or verses from Pindar, but also selects words and paraphrases verses and passages. His text of Pindar precedes by several centuries the archetype of the Byzantine manuscript tradition, and this makes his testimony important.

A detailed and comprehensive study of the Pindaric quotations in Aristides currently represents a gap in the studies of both authors. Although much has been written about Aristides, not much attention has been paid to his use of Pindaric quotations.

My intention has been to lay some of the groundwork for the elimination of this gap by selecting an area of study of sufficiently small compass to make a full examination of Aristides' relation with Pindar feasible.

Although other authors of the second sophistic movement make use of poetry, Aristides in his use of Pindaric quotations emerges as unique in that he makes *substantial* references to the *original* text of poets and in particular *Pindar*.

The most important points discussed in my thesis are:

1. The purpose, accuracy and comprehension with which Aristides quotes Pindar.
2. How Pindaric quotations lend authority and reinforce his views.
3. The nature of the possible sources that Aristides employed for his quotations from Pindar: original edition, paraphrase, anthologies, *ὑπομνήματα*, etc.

Division and structure of the thesis

The whole corpus of the thesis is divided into five major parts:

- I. **Part A** : Aelius Aristides and Pindar in the Second Sophistic.
- II. **Part B** : (*main part*): Discussion of the Pindaric Quotations.
- III. **Conclusions.**
- IV. **Appendix — Indexes.**
- V. **Bibliography**

More precisely the above parts have the following structure:

I. Part A: The main stages of Aristides' life are outlined in the first section of the introduction, with special attention to his education, his intellectual outlook, and his career development. The second part is concerned with the discussion of: *i.* the epideictic oratory and the related forms in Aristides' time; *ii.* continuities between archaic lyric and sophistic oratory; *iii.* Aristides as a second century intellectual; *iv.* the *Nachleben* of Pindar, in general and in the specific area of second century culture and oratory. Various aspects of Aristides' quotations from classical authors, and the principles and techniques according to which he quotes Pindar, are examined in the third section. In the concluding part I try to define the nature of the possible sources that Aristides employed for his quotations from Pindar: original edition, paraphrase, anthologies, *ὑπομνήματα*, etc.

II. Part B: This is the main body of the thesis and it takes the form of comparative discussions of each Pindaric quotation as used by Aristides showing the exact use he made of them. They illustrate Aristides' habit of adapting Pindar's words to both the style and the meaning of his own orations in order to meet his rhetorical agenda or to suit his idiom.

This main section is divided into 25 sections. The content of every section consists of the discussion either of an individual Pindaric quotation cited alone in Aristides' context, or a group of them that are given in sequence and close proximity to each other and ultimately perform the same function in his speech (*i.e.* praise, etc).

The structure adopted for each chapter can have the following form:

1. A brief account of the oration as a whole: it mainly concerns matters of date, literary genre, occasion of the speech, and other general literary issues.

2. The analysis of Aristides' context that follows the introductory note attempts to introduce the reader to the points which Aristides tries to raise with his quotation(s) from Pindar. Particular attention is paid as to how Pindaric quotations function within the context of Aristides' *argumentatio* and how these support his overall rhetorical purpose.

3. Pindar's context: an account of what the lyric poet meant or intended in his original text is considered essential so as to appreciate the degree of Aristides' perception and comprehension of Pindar and also to point out the role of the quotation in his rhetorical agenda.¹

4. Concluding discussion on the question of the transmission and reception of Pindar. Despite certain cases in which we have adequate textual indications about the

¹. It should be noticed that the order of exposition was not followed strictly in cases that a number of Pindaric quotations are cited from the same composition (*i.e.* *hymn to Zeus*, fr. 76), or are given together by Aristides forming a group (*i.e.* *Ol.* II.86ff.). This was thought expedient in order to avoid unwanted repetition.

nature of Aristides' source, the lack of conclusive evidence gives a speculative character to the discussion of the possible sources.

III. Conclusions

IV. Appendix: Aristides as a Second Century Intellectual

Indexes: I have appended the following three indexes:

1. '*Index of Pindaric quotations*'. The purpose of this index is to show which parts of Pindar's odes were quoted by Aristides, and to facilitate reference to the sections of the thesis I have discussed them.

2. '*Distribution of Pindaric quotations in Aristides according to the chronological order of his orations*'. This index aims to show the use of Pindar that Aristides made in the various stages of his career. The comparative texts of Pindar and Aristides are given in Behr's chronological order of Aristides' orations (printed in his *Aelius Aristides* 1968a).

3. '*General Index of quotations in Aristides*'. I have indexed all the quotations —(literary, philosophical, historical)— to give an insight into the reading of classical literature in Aristides' education.

V. Bibliography

The classification of the Pindaric Quotations

The classification of the individual quotations has been arranged in terms of their function in Aristides' context. This chosen form of presentation aims to distinguish Pindaric quotations in wider categories classified according to the rhetoric of their role in the text of the second century orator.

I have distinguished the following four main categories:

- Quotations in *PRAISE* of:
 1. **Gods** (: religious – hymnal character)
 2. **Individuals** (: complimentary–laudatory–consolatory)
 3. Ancient **Cities** (: complimentary)
- Quotations in support of Aristides' *ARGUMENTATIO*:
 1. Quotations in Polemic treatises against Plato:
 - i. '*In defence of Oratory*' (Or. II)
 - ii. '*In defence of the Four*' (Or. III)
 2. Quotations against contemporary '*Sophists*'.
 3. Quotations: comparison in terms of '*concord*' and '*beauty*'.
 4. Other quotations in support of Aristides' '*argumentatio*'.
- Quotations for *ORNAMENTAL* and *DECORATIVE* purposes.
- *UNCLASSIFIED Quotation*.

The following table reflects the structure of the main section (part B) of the thesis:

II. PRAISE

[1]. for GODS (religious-hymnal character)	[2]. for INDIVIDUAL(S) (complimentary/laudatory/consolatory)	[3]. for Ancient CITIES (complimentary)
1. <i>fr.</i> *31 = <i>Or.</i> II.420 <i>fr.</i> *35a = <i>Or.</i> XLIII.30 <i>fr.</i> 32 = <i>Or.</i> III.620 <i>fr.</i> *33 = <i>Or.</i> III.620 <i>fr.</i> 33c.5 = <i>Or.</i> XLIII.13 <i>fr.</i> 33c.5 = <i>Or.</i> XLIV.14 <i>fr.</i> *33d.1-2 = <i>Or.</i> XXXVIII.12 <hr/> 2. <i>fr.</i> 146 = <i>Or.</i> XXXVII.6 <hr/> 3. <i>Ol.</i> VII.7 = <i>Or.</i> XXXIX.16 <hr/> 4. <i>fr.</i> *99 = <i>Or.</i> XLI.6 <i>fr.</i> 283? = <i>Or.</i> XLI.6 <hr/> 5. <i>fr.</i> 95 = <i>Or.</i> XLII.12	1. <i>fr.</i> 95 = <i>Or.</i> III.191 <hr/> 2. <i>fr.</i> 136a = <i>Or.</i> XXXI.12 <hr/> 3. <i>fr.</i> 129.7 = <i>Or.</i> XXXII.34 <hr/> 4. <i>Ol.</i> IX.26 = <i>Or.</i> XXX.16	1. <i>fr.</i> 76.2 = <i>Or.</i> I.401 <i>fr.</i> 76.2 = <i>Or.</i> VIII.21 <i>fr.</i> 76.2 = <i>Or.</i> XX.13 <i>fr.</i> 76.2 = <i>Or.</i> I.9 <i>fr.</i> 76.2 = <i>Or.</i> I.124 <hr/> 2. <i>Ol.</i> I.38-9 = <i>Or.</i> XVII.3 <i>Ol.</i> I.26-7,49 = <i>Or.</i> XXI.10 <hr/> 3. <i>Pyth.</i> III.43 = <i>Or.</i> XVII.4

III. ARGUMENT

[1]. Quotations in Polemic treatises against Plato	[2]. Quotations against contemporary 'Sophists'
i. ' <u>In defence of Oratory</u> ' (<i>Or.</i> II): 1. <i>Ol.</i> II.86-8 = <i>Or.</i> II.109 <i>Ol.</i> IX.100-2 = <i>Or.</i> II.110 <i>Ol.</i> IX.27-9 = <i>Or.</i> II.110 <i>fr.</i> *38 = <i>Or.</i> II.112 <i>fr.</i> *38 = <i>Or.</i> III.466 <hr/> 2. <i>Pyth.</i> VIII.95 = <i>Or.</i> II.148 <hr/> 3. <i>fr.</i> 169a.1-8 = <i>Or.</i> II.226-8 <i>fr.</i> 81 = <i>Or.</i> II.229 <i>fr.</i> 169a.16-7 = <i>Or.</i> II.229 <i>Pyth.</i> II.94-5 = <i>Or.</i> II.230 <i>Pyth.</i> II.96 = <i>Or.</i> II.230 <hr/> ii. ' <u>In defence of the Four</u> ' (<i>Or.</i> III): 4. <i>fr.</i> 48 = <i>Or.</i> III.37 (Pericles) <hr/> 5. <i>fr.</i> 260 = <i>Or.</i> III.478 (Pericles)	1. <i>fr.</i> 226 = <i>Or.</i> XXXIV.5 <i>fr.</i> 182 = <i>Or.</i> XXXIV.5 <i>Pyth.</i> III.83 = <i>Or.</i> XXXIV.8 <i>Ol.</i> I.30ff., 44 = <i>Or.</i> XXXIV.25 <hr/> [3]. Quotations: Comparison in terms of 'concord' and 'beauty' <hr/> 1. <i>Ol.</i> VII.54-5,57,67-8 = <i>Or.</i> XXV.29 <i>Ol.</i> VII.49-50 = <i>Or.</i> XXV.30 <i>Ol.</i> VII.58,62,65,68 = <i>Or.</i> XXIV.50 <hr/> 2. <i>Pyth.</i> IX.95? = <i>Or.</i> XXIII.36 <hr/> [4]. Other quotations in support of Aristides' 'argumentatio' <hr/> 1. <i>Ol.</i> II.86-8 = <i>Or.</i> XXVIII.55 <i>fr.</i> 237 = <i>Or.</i> XXVIII.56 <i>fr.</i> 194.1-3,4-5 = <i>Or.</i> XXVIII.57 <i>Pae.</i> VI.1-6 = <i>Or.</i> XXVIII.58 <hr/> 2. <i>fr.</i> 108 (a) = <i>Or.</i> XXVII.2 <i>fr.</i> 108 (a) = <i>Or.</i> XXXIII.1

IV. ORNAMENTATION

V. UNCLASSIFIED QUOTATION

1. <i>fr.</i> 329 = <i>Or.</i> XXVI.1	1. <i>fr.</i> 201 = <i>Or.</i> XXXVI.11
2. <i>fr.</i> 75.14 = <i>Or.</i> XX.21 <i>fr.</i> 75.14 = <i>Or.</i> XLVI.25	

Problems in classifying Pindaric quotations:

The multiplicity of the functions of certain Pindaric quotations renders difficult their precise classification in terms of their role in Aristides' rhetorical agenda. This arrangement is purely conventional aiming primarily to allow a discussion of genuinely interesting issues of interpretation. The problem looms larger in the polemical treatises (*Ors.* II, III), where Aristides aims to refute Plato's vilification of his “pure art”, and to answer his disparaging remarks against the *Four* Athenian leaders (*i.e.* Themistocles, Kimon, Miltiades, Pericles):

1. The four quotations from the *hymn to Zeus* are discussed together. The advantage of this is that the reader is enabled to study the quotations in the framework of the hymn from which they come, so that they do not appear out of context. This method, too, shows how Aristides employed sections from the hymn to fulfil various rhetoric needs (*i.e.* ‘praise’: *frs.* 32, *33; ‘refutation of Platonic charge’: *frs.* *31, *35a), as well as the form he chose to cite them (paraphrase).

2. Given the number of Aristides' quotations from *Ol.* VII, is likely that he knew a complete text; for that reason I have integrated the Pindaric quotations in *Or.* XXV (‘*Ποδιακός*’) together with those in *Or.* XXIV, since both come under the general topic “Omonoia of the Greek cities”.

3. A similar case is represented with *fr.* 95; although it is part of Aristides' argumentation to illustrate the quality of Miltiades' administration, I have classified it as ‘praise’ of the Athenian leader on the grounds that:

a. the words seem to lend more credit to Miltiades' πολιτεία than it seems to be the case with *frs.* 48 and 260;

b. a similar version of *fr.* 95 is repeated in *Or.* XLII, functioning as explicit praise of Asclepius. For methodological reasons I decided to group together *frs.* 95 and *99 as coming from the same ‘*hymn to Pan*’.

4. I have classified *fr.* 260 among those lending authority to Aristides' *argumentatio* in supporting Pericles being compared to Palamedes with reference to their wisdom; however Pindar's words themselves are addressed as a kind of praise of the Athenian leader.

5. Under the category “*Unclassified Quotation*”, I have classified the *fr.* 201, since it does not fall within the above prescribed categories: Aristides quotes *fr.* 201 to

criticise and correct Pindar's geographical inaccuracies in his treatment of an Egyptian custom.

6. For reasons of space I have excluded *fr. 77*. I have considered its exclusion innocuous on the grounds that both Aristides' context and the quotation itself are of no great significance to our research. With regards to its function – directed as praise of Themistocles and the Athenian leadership in the time of the Persian invasion (: sea-battle of Artemision) – *fr. 77* is identical to *frs. 95 & 260*.

PART A

**I. Aelius Aristides and Pindar
in the Second Sophistic**

I. Background to the Life and Works of Aelius Aristides

1.1. Descent - Education.¹

Publius Aelius Theodorus Aristides² enjoyed enormous popularity for his rhetorical power.³ He was one of the most celebrated orators of the Greek renaissance, known from Flavius Philostratus as the “*Second Sophistic movement*”. He was born on 26 November AD 117,⁴ at Hadriani⁵ in northern Mysia in the tribal area of the Olympe from a wealthy family.⁶ However, Aristides was a citizen of Smyrna and was immensely fond of that city, as *Ors.* XVII-XXI testify.⁷ His father Eudaemon, a priest of Zeus, owned an estate in Mysia and in AD 123, he was enfranchised with Roman citizenship by Hadrian.⁸

Apparently wealthy, Aristides was given the finest education available. He started his studies at Smyrna, where he studied Greek poetry and prose under the grammaticus Alexander of Cotiaeum.⁹ Aristides accomplished his studies by attending the lectures of the foremost sophists of that time. Suda informs us that he heard Herodes Atticus, a multimillionaire in Athens, and Antonius Polemo in Smyrna. He also received instruction from Claudius Aristocles in Pergamum, and studied philosophy under the Pergamene Gaius and the Athenian Lucius.¹⁰

Aristides determined to become a professional orator at a time when Greek oratory was enjoying a renewed popularity. He devoted himself to the study of rhetoric, and along with it he cultivated poetry as an amusement.

1.2. Chronological outline of Aristides' career.

The literary and rhetorical career of Aristides falls within the following main periods:

¹ The history of Aristides' life is complex and in part controversial. The arguments, which I have used in determining Aristides' history, are mainly drawn from Behr 1968a: ch. I-V, *id.* 1994: 1140-1233, and *id.* 1973 (Loeb): vii-xxi.

² The name Θεόδωρος is recorded in *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).53. His full name is found in *OGIS* 709.

³ For Aristides' reputation, cf. the verdicts of Phrynichus, *Sophist's Stock-in-Trade*, in Phot., *Bibl. cod.* 158, 101a, Hermogenes compared him to Demosthenes: 353. 24ff. Rabe. Cf. also Philostr. *VS* 2.9.581-5 and Longin. *Fr.* 6, 12 (214.6, 215.10 Sp.-H.).

⁴ Cf. Behr 1969: 75-7. The horoscope and his date of birth are given together in *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).58.

⁵ Philostr. *VS* 2.9.581 gives Hadriani as his birthplace. In favour of Hadriani see Behr's arguments (1968a: 3-4 n.3), against the modern assumption that Hadrianotherae was Aristides' birthplace.

⁶ Cf. Philostr. *VS* 2.9.581, and the entry in Suda s.v. Aristides. For the agricultural wealth of the area cf. Schwertheim 1987: 133-41 and Swain 1996: 256 n.11.

⁷ For Smyrnean citizenship cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).73,103.

⁸ Cf. Sherwin-White 1973: 259, 261, 286; cf. also Behr 1968a: 4-5.

⁹ Alexander later instructed Lucius Verus and the future emperor Marcus Aurelius, cf. *Or.* XXXII.

¹⁰ Behr 1968a: 10-3, 54. For Aristides' teachers cf. also Swain 1996: 256 with n.13.

i. AD 141—145

After being sufficiently prepared for his profession he travelled extensively and visited various places in Asia, Africa, especially Egypt, Greece, and Italy, where he declaimed with varying success. During this period and afterwards, Aristides resided at Smyrna, where enjoying great honours and distinctions he spent a considerable time. From Smyrna he made occasional excursions to other cities of the province, to Pergamum, Phocaea, Cyzicus, and other towns.

In AD 141, Aristides set out on a tour to Egypt. With Alexandria as the base of his operations, he travelled extensively up to the first cataract, where he fell ill¹¹ and returned back to Smyrna seeking the help of Sarapis, to whom he composed his oldest hymn (*Or.* XLV).

In AD 144 his ambitions for a political career sent him to Rome at the age of 26, on the instigation of his teachers (Alexander and Herodes). Shortly before his departure, Aristides was attacked by an illness which partly real, partly imagined, lasted for thirteen years. He had from his childhood been of a weakly constitution, but he was not prevented by his protracted illness from prosecuting his studies and his career. The trip was a complete failure, and totally unable to fulfil his plans he returned home. Aristides on his return to Asia, having abandoned his hopes for a political career, received the first revelations from the “saviour” at the end of 144.¹²

ii. AD 145—147 <Cathedra>

Καὶ παρελθόντος ἐνιαυτοῦ καὶ μηνῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐν Περγάμῳ καθέδραν ἦλθομεν
(*Hieros Logos* 2 (48). 70).

Aristides reached Pergamum in summer AD 145. The “*Cathedra*”¹³ means properly a “period of inactivity”. But it had a special significance for Aristides, who used the term exclusively for this time of his life as an incubant at the temple of Asclepius in Pergamum (AD 145-147). The end of the *Cathedra* is marked by Aristides' trip to Lebedus.¹⁴ The most singular side of his character during that period was his devotion to the healing god Asclepius and his long struggle to be well. The temple of Asclepius¹⁵ at

¹¹. *Or.* XXXVI.49.

¹². Cf. *Hieros Logos* 2 (48).7. Apart from Asclepius Aristides retained real belief also in other divinities: Sarapis, Athena, Dionysus, Apollo, Heracles, Zeus, Isis. For the eclectic polytheism of that time see Behr 1968a: ch.VI.

¹³. For the term cf. subscription to *Or.* XXX, and *Hieros Logos* 3 (49).44. On the *Cathedra* cf. Behr 1968a: 26 n.20 and p.43 n.9, who is right in assuming that Aristides chose this name thinking wistfully of a chair of rhetoric. Swain's argument (1996: 257 n.15), that the term *Cathedra* was in use only later has some weight: SIG³ 845.

¹⁴. Cf. *Hieros Logos* 3 (49).7, which Behr (1968a: 61 n.1), dates to late September AD 147; Boulanger (1923: 135), is very confused about the length of the *Cathedra* and has it last four or five years. Cf. Behr's opposite argument 1968a: 43 n.9, and also 26 n.19.

¹⁵. The original temple was dated back to the middle of the fourth century BC. During the last part of Hadrian's reign and the beginning of Pius, the temple was rebuilt. For the temple see Le Glay 1976: 347-72; Swain 1996: 257 with n.17. For the sanctuary as a cult site see Behr 1968a: 27-40.

Pergamum, one of the chief healing sites of the ancient world, was a meeting place for members of the Hellenic and Roman elite who sought the god's healing through the practice of "incubation".¹⁶

In the milieu of the temple, Aristides made some important acquaintances with powerful Greek and Roman figures, who formed a literary circle and whose influence Aristides employed in his later legal battles for immunity.

iii. AD 147—153

Aristides' ambition is revitalised, first in dreams and then in speaking before small and select audiences. He is once again an active and copious writer and a lecturer.¹⁷ He strongly believes that his oratory is God-given, and his rhetorical career is due to Asclepius' grace. The abandonment of the god means for Aristides the abandonment of his rhetoric. Further he assumes that his illness was the vehicle for his success.

During this time Aristides fights to avoid the responsibilities of various public offices and liturgies enjoined on him by the cities and governors of the province of Asia.¹⁸ Aristides, animated by a close interest in his own art, chooses finally to avoid the civic political duties that his social background called on him to perform.¹⁹ He also avoids committing himself to any obligation, *e.g.* that of a paid teacher.

iv. AD 154—164

In this period Aristides has recovered completely and resumes his career on a full scale. He delivers lectures and speeches in various Greek cities and finally, succeeds in speaking before the highly literate imperial court of the capital of the world. In this time the orator accepts students but he still avoids taking fees (*Or.* XXII.16). Among them was the teacher of Philostratus, Damianus.

v. AD 165—189

In the summer of AD 165 Aristides was struck down by an epidemic of smallpox from which he survived with many after-effects.

Aristides had great influence with the emperor Marcus Aurelius, whose acquaintance he had formed in AD 176, when Marcus visited Smyrna, and Aristides spoke before the imperial court with success. When in AD 177 Smyrna was destroyed by an earthquake, Aristides wrote appeals to Marcus, who generously assisted the

¹⁶. That practice primarily consists in spending the night in the precinct of sanctuary awaiting instructions given from Asclepius through dreams as therapeutic prescriptions (*e.g.* bathing in swollen rivers, bloodletting, enemas, vomiting).

¹⁷. In the next six years he travelled between his estates in Mysia, Asclepieion, and the city of Smyrna.

¹⁸. In AD 147 Aristides was nominated as high-priest of Asia, in AD 151 he was elected a tax-collector in Smyrna, and the next year he was appointed as Eirenarch by Julius Severus.

¹⁹. Bowersock 1968: 36-40; Swain 1996: 268 n.56.

Smyrnaeans in rebuilding their town, and speeches to its governor and citizens in celebration of its reconstruction.²⁰

Aristides spent the last part of his life on his estates in Mysia, where he died from consumption in AD 189.²¹

1.3 The Writings of Aelius Aristides.

Aristides' canonisation as a model of artistic style in antiquity and his popularity in the Byzantine period have ensured that very many of his works survive.²² The extant corpus of Aristides' works is comprised of fifty five orations and declamations, and two treatises on rhetorical subjects: *περὶ πολιτικοῦ λόγου καὶ περὶ ἀφελοῦς λόγου*.²³ It should also be mentioned that we possess some poetic fragments, and consecrational inscriptions and words of thanks on a large number of shrines sacred to Asclepius. Aristides' works fall into the following categories or rather can be arranged in the following stylistic spectrum:

i. **Panegyrics** on towns, such as Smyrna, Cyzicus, Rome, Pergamum; one among them is *Panathenaicus*, an imitation of that of Isocrates, which was used as a schoolbook in Byzantine times.

ii. **Polemic treatises** against Plato's charges in *Grg.* (: *Ors.* II,III,IV), and XXXVI "Egyptian".

iii. **Symbolleutic** speeches on various occasions: *Ors.* XVII-XXVII, XXIX.

iv. **Treatises** on subjects connected with rhetoric and eloquence: *Ors.* XXVIII, XXXIII, XXXIV.

v. **Prose-hymns**: these are eulogies on the power of the celebrated divinities. Aristides claimed to be the originator of the "prose-hymn" to the gods.²⁴ Stylistically the prose-hymns are an extreme form of Asianism.²⁵

vi. **Ἱεροὶ λόγοι** (*Ors.* XLVII-LII): a desultory compilation of 130 dreams, over a span of 25 years; a sort of dream-diary of his illness and his recovery, where he relates that he was frequently encouraged by visions in his dreams to cultivate rhetoric.²⁶

vii. **Individual speeches**: a birthday speech (*Or.* XXX), and two funeral orations (XXXI, XXXII).

viii. **Declamations**: *Ors.* V-XVI.

Aristides stands out as a purist Atticist orator. Following Isocrates he sees in rhetoric a higher goal (opposed to the more base interests of the sophists), and he refrains from judicial or disputatory orations, to reserve his "god-given", as he proclaims, art to

²⁰. The Smyrnaeans showed their gratitude to Aristides by erecting to him a brazen statue in their agora, and by calling him the founder of their town (cf. Philostr. *VS* 2.9.582. The memory of Aristides was honoured in several ancient towns by statues. Liban. *Epist.* 1551).

²¹. The majority of the scholars accept 189 as the date of his death. Behr suggests the year AD 180.

²². Schmid 1887-97: vol. II. 7 n.14, 14, *id.* 1896: 892; Boulanger 1923: 452-7.

²³. These works ascribed to Aristides were certainly not written by him (cf. *Εἰς βασιλέα*), but such use of his name shows his unchallenged position of authority in the Late Classical and the Byzantine age.

²⁴. On Aristides' development of the "prose-hymn" see Russell 1990a (with reference to earlier discussions by Lenz and Gigli). Cf. also Norden 1898: vol.II. 844ff.; Weinreich 1914: 602; Wünsch, *RE* IX. 1 (1914) 173 s.v. Hymnos; Boulanger 1923: 182ff, 309ff.; Mesk 1927: 660, 665ff., 672; Bowersock 1969: 8, 117.

²⁵. *E.g.* The short rhythmical cola, non-periodic structures, rhetoric figures: asyndeton, isocolon, anaphora, and plangent tone similar to his epideictic compositions. Further see Russell 1990a: 200-1, who stylistically separates the prose-hymns into those which present more "hymnic" elements, influenced by Plato or cult language (Athena, Zeus, Sarapis, Dionysus), and those which resemble more the *epideictic* and *encomiastic* style (Poseidon, Aegean Sea, Heracles, Asclepius).

²⁶. To the understanding of the structure of *Hieroi Logoi*, Behr's work on them is important. For a bibliography on *Hieroi Logoi* cf. Swain 1996: 254 in n.3.

nobler causes served in declamatory orations. He takes rhetoric as equivalent to poetry in diction and power of expression; his orations represent a highly stylistic and very disciplined effort. Although often thought of as inferior to Plutarch, Dio or Lucian in the content of what he has to say, his style was recognised to epitomise the essence of Imperial Atticism. A most fervent exponent of Attic purism, Phrynichus, in his Sophists' Stock-in-Trade (*Praeparatio Sophistica*) reserves a special laudatory comment on Aristides' atticism (Photius' *Library*, cod. 18, 101a).²⁷

His ideal was the “ἀρχαία ιδέα”, “ὀρθότης”, “ἀκρίβεια” and “ἀσφάλεια” (cf. *Or.* XXXIV.11). Aristides insists on the exact imitation of the classical model; his work as a whole is a “pastiche perpétuel”.²⁸

Aristides' stylistic abilities and his attempts at emulating the great Attic writers made him famous. He had studied Classical literature to such an extent that his mastery of the Atticist literary language very soon led to the recognition of his writings as stylistic models equivalent to Classical texts themselves. As a stylist, Aristides was widely thought to be on a par with Demosthenes.²⁹ Eunapius appraising his attic style called him “divine”.³⁰ In this line later orators such as Libanius attempted to imitate him.³¹

Aristides as an orator had a grander view regarding his art and its aims than most rhetoricians in his time, whose great and only ambition was to shine and make a momentary impression by extempore speeches and a brilliant and dazzling style. His devotion to oratory has a religious zeal related by him to the divine call to embark on this career, while his Isocratean view regarding the tasks of oratory recalls and attempts to fulfil some of the hopes for great and philosophical oratory we also see in Quintilian at the end of his work.

A number of orators and philosophers criticised him, among whom are mentioned Palladius (Liban. *Epist.* 546), Sergius, and Porphyrius.³² But the number of his admirers was far greater, and several learned grammarians wrote commentaries on his orations. Besides Athanasius, Menander, and others, whose works are lost, we have copious scholia from Sopater of Apamea, the author of the Greek *prolegomena* to Aristides' orations. The greater part of these scholia are probably compilations from the commentaries of Arethas, Metrophanes, and other grammarians. The *editio princeps* of

27. Swain 1996: 254 n.1.

28. Boulanger 1923: 446.

29. According to the author of the *Προλεγόμενα* to the *Panathenaicus* (vol.III, 741-2 Dind.), Aristides was the first τὸν Δημοσθένην μιμούμενος.

30. p.494 Boissonade.

31. Nicolaus in fourth century assumed in his students a good knowledge of Greek literature so as to understand references to passages in Demosthenes, Isocrates, Homer, Plato, and Aristides. The name Aelius (which probably is Aelius Aristides), heads a library's catalogue preserved in P. Ross. Georg. 1.22 (AD III Memphis).

32. Suid. s.v.

the orations of Aristides is that of Florence in 1517 by the doctor Eufrosino Bonino, “*Orationes Aristidis*”, at the press of Filippo Giunta.³³

* * *

³³. Keil has shown that Bonino employed *Laurentianus Abbatiae* 9 for most of the first 25 orations of his edition. He then began to use *Laurentianus* LX, 24 *et* 20 for the section XXXVIII - XLVI; see **Lenz-Behr** 1976: Cliff. with n.16. Aristides was later edited by **H. Stephanus** (Paris 1593); **P. Stephanus** (Geneva 1604), and **S. Jebb** (Oxford 1722); **W. Dindorf** (Leipzig: 1829).

2. Epideictic Oratory and related forms in Aristides' period.

Aristotle's classification of the genres (γένη) of civic discourse and of rhetoric especially, as συμβουλευτικὸν γένος (*genus deliberativum*), δικανικὸν γένος (*genus iudiciale*) and ἐπιδεικτικὸν γένος (*genus demonstrativum*)¹ was accepted and used by later rhetoricians (and often specifically attributed to him).²

His definition of epideictic as “that which is concerned with what is most honourable, characterised by praise and blame, referring to the present” formulated the blueprint of the conception of epideictic throughout antiquity.³

Epideictic oratory traces its origin back to the fifth century BC, when prose emerged to rival poetry as a dignified art form of its own; great festivals (πανηγύρεις) attracted not only poets but also orators exhibiting the virtues of prose speech to convey admirable as well as convincing *encomia*. These laudatory orations were delivered in real occasions which required the appropriate encomiastic response, but there were also orations which circulated in pamphlets. Gorgias' *Olympic Speech* had soon become the model of epideictic oratorical speeches.

The rivalry between philosophers and sophists drew their interest to the study and debate over the real nature and purpose of praise and blame. Whereas philosophers like Plato and Aristotle would delve into the true nature and the ethos of praise (and blame), sophists would choose to impress audiences with the expediency of well crafted speeches to meet any challenge and convincingly extol the most unlikely objects. A characteristic example of the latter is Polycrates' *encomia* of the Egyptian tyrant Busiris, of Clytemnestra, of mice and of salt; the variety and novelty exhibited in these works had gained them great popularity.⁴ Beside Aristotle's theorisation of the genre in his *Rhetoric*, Plato shows knowledge of epideictic speeches which appear in his dialogues, particular in *Menexenus* and the *Symposium*, in parodic form. Agathon's *encomium* of Eros in the Platonic *Symposium* (194e-197e) is an example of the Platonic parodic *encomia*, and contains the model of the *topos* of ‘Four Virtues’ which became a traditional way of

¹. Τὸ ἐπιδεικτικὸν γένος (Aristot. *rhet.* 1.3, 1358b,8), *genus demonstrativum* (*Rhet. Her.* 1.2), *laudativum genus* (Quint. *IO* 3.7.28): the model case is the speech given before a ceremonial gathering in praise of a city, community, person, (: historical, mythological, or contemporary), activity, or thing that is to be celebrated. Cf. Lausberg 1998: §§243-7. The *officia* of the genre are praise for the beautiful (καλόν), and blame for the ugly (αἰσχρόν).

². However there have also been dissenting views. Quintilian devotes a chapter (*IO* 3.4) to the question whether there are three or more genres, referring to views of some authorities that there are numerous genres; he ends by accepting that the traditional triad is “easy and neat” rather than true, as he finds that “they all rely on mutual aid”, i.e. one speech may include elements of all three.

³. Considering Aristotle's definition as too narrow, Kennedy (1997: 45) proposes his definition of epideictic oratory: “Epideictic is perhaps best regarded as including any discourse, oral or written, that does not aim at a specific action or decision but seeks to enhance knowledge, understanding or belief, often through praise or blame whether of persons, things or values... It is thus an important feature of cultural or group cohesion”.

⁴. On this see Russell-Wilson 1981: xiii ff. with n.10.

praising great men: Aeschylus' Amphiaraios (*Th.* 610) is 'σώφρων δίκαιος ἀγαθὸς εὐσεβὴς ἀνὴρ'; Plato is using it with the philosophical intention of analysing the true nature of Eros.

Isocrates introduces the didactic element in epideictic oratory, composing an *encomium* of the deceased king of Salamis in Cyprus Evagoras for the benefit of his son Nicocles. His example is echoed in Menander's treatise *Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, in the late third century AD, where much of Isocrates' model is connoted in his prescriptions for *βασιλικὸς λόγος* (p.368ff.), how to write an *encomium* for a king.

In general, orators of the Second Sophistic and later studied the models of the fourth century BC: Plato's *Menexenus*, the *Epitaphius* of Hyperides and those attributed to Lysias and Demosthenes. Epitaphs, through the appeal of their fascinating historical significance had always attracted as prime examples of *encomia*. Menander's treatise on Epideictic Oratory offers ample evidence of how the Thucydidean model of 'Epitaphios' had remained the unrivalled archetypal model for any kind of memorial address.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Hermogenes and other later Greek rhetoricians sometimes treat all literature as a form of epideictic, subject to rhetorical analysis at least in terms of style. Aristotle considers epideictic oratory as finer and of more interest than the other two *genera* and also thinks deliberative rhetoric as of more general interest than judicial rhetoric; he therefore criticises⁵ the fact that more books in his time were devoted to judicial rhetoric. This is also true for most later rhetorical treatises: Stasis theory, which is their main object of discussion, is a method of determining the question at issue in trials. Cicero's *De Inventione* and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* only briefly discuss epideictic oratory. Roman rhetoric was instinctively connected to law and there were very rare Latin counterparts of Greek epideictic,⁶ of which there are several books during the Hellenistic era and later antiquity.

Secular panegyric advanced to become a major oratorical form in late antiquity,⁷ taught in schools and practised throughout the Roman Empire by sophists. Such public speeches,⁸ addressed to individuals of the stature of an emperor or governor or in public assemblies on festival occasions, often contained unabashed flattery of important addressees, although the best examples of these orations retained a didactic element setting out ideas of conduct for the edification of the addressee and the wider public. Already the increased monarchical tendencies of the centuries preceding the Roman

⁵. *Rhet.* 1.1, 1354b.22-9.

⁶. Kennedy (1997: 46) contends that there are no Latin epideictic speeches. However, we have the example of the *Panegyricoi* that start with Pliny's *Panegyricus* in which he emphasises the bad features of the Domitian era. See Russell-Wilson 1981: xviii.

⁷. *Πανηγυρικός*, as a particular kind of epideictic speech is described in Longinus *On Epideictic Speeches*; but does not correspond with any type of speech in Menander.

⁸. Public performance marked the difference between a sophist and a rhetor; the term σοφιστεύων signified a person who was pursuing a career involving the activity of giving of public performances. Cf. Bowie 1974: 169 with n.4.

conquest had cultivated the practice of the *encomia* to rulers which, however, existed side by side with less political epideictic speeches which were delivered for prizes throughout the Hellenistic world.

Speeches of welcome, of thanks, or of pleading towards Roman rulers and dignitaries, were a commonplace throughout the Greek world. Menander's *Treatise II*, parades the typology of public events occasioning epideictic oratorical responses, as were the arrivals and departures of governors, embassies to monarchs seeking privileges or offering honour, presentations of crowns, official invitations. The particular political situation cultivated the real need for cities, and their Greek aristocracies, to rise to the demands of ceremonial formality and celebration entailed by public events involving the Roman rulers. Public epideictic orations thus served the expediencies of political action, and at the same time offered the opportunity of using a common interest in rhetorical technique as "a bond of connection between the orators and the culture-hungry Roman aristocracy".⁹

Yet, although the life of the semi-autonomous cities of the Greek East did offer dignified opportunities for orators to demonstrate their skills (and could serve as sufficient encouragement for ambitious young members of the Greek aristocracies to pursue the career of an orator), these were not deemed as sufficient occasions for an orator to exercise his art in epideictic speech making. A series of private events offered an array of opportunities for orators to indulge in epideictic rhetoric of the kind that was often seen to allow for more variety and novelty and which left more room for the orator to impress the impressionable audience with the polish of their artistry.

Epideictic oratory gave the orator the opportunity to exercise skills in all parts of rhetorical theory (invention, arrangement, style, memory and delivery), and also allowed the display of rich imagery in creating fictitious objects, thereby encouraging artificiality in thought and language which left its impression on literary composition.

Menander's *Treatise II* on the kinds of epideictic thus enumerates a series of epideictic orations responding to such circumstances of private events, for example, private weddings, funerals, arrivals or departures. These types of events were generally lacking in Hellenistic and Classical oratory where the subjects concerned public events of significance. In the times of the first centuries of the empire, the range of epideictic speeches was extended to cover the range reflected in Menander's *Treatise II*, represented in the *laliai* (λαλιαί), that is, informal talks characterised by spontaneity and variety, or *μονωδίαι*, that is, emotional funeral or disaster speeches, like Aristides' *μονωδία* on the earthquake of Smyrna.

⁹. Russell-Wilson 1981: xvii.

The teaching of epideictic oratory

Sophists and their students also practised epideictic oratory in their schools. The two handbooks of epideictic by Menander Rhetor (or rather the two authors behind the books, dating perhaps to the end of the 3rd century AD) describe seven kinds of prose hymns and sixteen other kinds of epideictic,¹⁰ with advice about division of the subject and the appropriate topics to employ.

The student used a knowledge of these conventional forms of orations on social occasions, including birthdays, weddings, funerals and the arrival or departure of friends. As we mentioned above, this is primarily a Greek activity, and there are no Latin examples and training in them was given only in Greek schools. Among the examples of orations the students were taught were certainly the orations preserved through *'onomatopoieia'* in historiography; the best example and paradigm of epideictic oration is the Funeral Oration (*Ἐπιτάφιος λόγος*) by Pericles. In general, however, instruction in the forms of epideictic oratory in the schools of rhetoric in late antiquity took the form of extracurricular activities; as in the classical time, students learned by *imitatio*, watching and listening to the sophists deliver various types of epideictic speeches and modelling theirs on their master's examples. *Προγυμνάσματα*, i.e. preliminary exercises in composition, offered students opportunities to practice standard techniques.¹¹

¹⁰. **Hymns**: εἰς τοὺς θεοὺς, κλητικοί, ἀποπεμπτικοί, φυσικοί, μυθικοί, γενεαλογικοί, ἀπευκτικοί - προσευκτικοί, πεπλασμένοι; **Epideictic speeches** (λαλιά): βασιλικός, προσφωνητικός, ἐπιβατήριος, πατριος, ἐπιτάφιος, παραμυθητικός, λαλιά, μονωδία, προπεμπτικός, στεφανωτικός, πρεσβευτικός, κτητικός, συντακτικός, σμινθιακός, ἐπιθαλάμιος (γαμήλιος), κατευναστικός, γενεθλιακός, κλητικός.

¹¹. Kennedy 1983: 60-6, also *Id.* 1972: 614ff.

3. Oratory and Poetry: continuities between archaic lyric poetry and sophistic oratory.

A continual reference to literature through poetic quotations and *sententiae* forms a high educational ethos which permeates ancient grammatical and literary education.

The explanation of the poets is a part of grammatical instruction and their study is continued intensively and repeatedly throughout the life of the orator.¹ Authors are judged and recommended for reading according to literary, stylistic, linguistic, and ethical criteria by means of 'literary criticism' (S.E. *M.* 1.248 ἡ κριτική [grammarians]; Quint. *IO* 10.1.40 *judicium*).² The *poetarum enarratio* (Quint. *IO* 1.4.2) or *enarratio auctorum* (Quint. *IO* 1.9.1) or *lectio* (Quint. *IO* 10.1.27) aim to provide *exempla* which serve as models for *imitatio* (Quint. *IO* 10.1.3) in grammatically correct speech, in style, and in literary structure. According to Quintilian (*IO* 10.1.19), repeated reading penetrates into the *memoria* and eventually leads to *imitatio*, with the aim if not to excel at least to reach the quality of the model.

The drawing up of a canon of authors to be read leads to a chronological history of literature,³ which in some cases is divided according to literary *genera*. Such a history is presented by Quintilian *IO* 10.1.46-131. The section §§46-72, contains a selection of the best models from Greek poetry (epic, lyric, dramatic). The study of Poetry here is considered as important for the orator, as conferring a greater elevation of spirit and diction, besides serving as a pleasurable recreation.⁴ After the praise of Homer (§§46-51) and the reference to Hesiod and other poets of the 'middle style', next come the elegiac poets, represented by Callimachus and Philetas (§58); of *iambographi* the typical poet is Archilochus (§59ff.), whereas the chief lyric poets are Pindar (§61), Stesichorus (§62), Alcaeus (§63), and Simonides (§64).

The most comprehensive education program in rhetoric includes the study of lyric poetry,⁵ where attention is drawn to the necessity of becoming accustomed with the style of the lyric model. If we look at the statistics of papyrus finds classed by literary genres, we find that dramatic poetry follows Homer and epic, with oratory and lyric in third and fourth positions respectively.⁶ We also know from the rhetorician's handbooks that the

1. Quint. *IO* 10.1.20 *perlectus liber utique ex integro resumendus*.

2. "Artistic" criteria do not always coincide with ethical criteria and entire genres must therefore be excluded or from certain works only parts may be read.

3. Quint. *IO* 10.1.46 *coepturi ab Homero*.

4. Quint. *IO* 10.1.27 *Namque ab his in rebus spiritus et in verbis sublimitas et in adfectibus motus omnis et in personis decor petitur*. So Longinus makes sublimity attainable by the imitation and emulation of the great poets of former days: 13.2.

5. The term 'lyric' (λυρικός) is a Hellenistic coinage, and expressed a definite and concrete notion: poetry accompanied by the lyre. It is noteworthy that the term is not found in ancient theories of art. The term is used in the same sense in the treatise *περὶ λυρικῶν* of Didymus, who in this respect as in others served as a bridge between the Alexandrians and imperial Rome.

6. However, we should be cautious in deciding about the popularity of an author based entirely on papyri finds. With few exceptions, these are not critical texts edited for scholarly and scientific purposes, as

reading of Lyric poetry was one of the exercises for older students when they reached the stage of the *progymnasmata*.⁷ Poetry provided not only stock examples for the familiarisation with various figures of speech but also furnished a readily available tradition to choose the subject matter. Disciples in rhetoric were asked to try their hand on various myths from poetry, and one particular kind of exercise would be for them to paraphrase a poem into prose.⁸

The lyric models of the archaic and classical times through their standardisation in the Alexandrian canon were particularly important in sophistic oratory. Contemporary rhetors enter into the traditional fields of poetry in order to meet their needs of praise. Whole genres like the *encomium* or the *epithalamium*, which once belonged to poetry, have now become the permanent property of rhetoric.⁹ How the orators wanted to imitate and emulate the poets everywhere is demonstrated by Aristides' addresses to the Gods (*Ors.* XXXVII-XLVI).¹⁰

The interaction between poetry and epideictic rhetoric appears however to have been a two way affair. For example, in adopting the *epithalamium*, originally a poetic genre, orators applied some rules which in turn influenced the verse *epithalamia*. It is in hymns and *epithalamia* which were the poetic genres primarily adopted by the orators that a greater overlapping in the use of *τόποι* is evidenced. As orators, keen to develop explicit theories of their *τόποι* formalised their prescriptions for their use, poets could have also benefited from this enriched stock of prescribed *τόποι*.

Lausberg illustrating the mutual relation of oratory to poetry, notes: "the mutual pervasiveness between the speech and poetry is a constant given in the history of literature, present right from the beginning: on one hand the speech employs mimetic, that is poetic, elements (cf. Lausberg §1163), while on the other hand poetry has to use the same means as the speech for the conceptual and linguistic development of its mimetic intent".¹¹

Imperial age orators consider it extremely profitable to read the writings of Epic and Lyric poets:

presumably was the case in the Library at Alexandria. They were rather, intended for an audience not particularly demanding, living in peripheral towns and villages of the Egyptian countryside, far removed from the important cultural movements of the capital. These were designed to answer the needs and requests arising among local readers, or for teaching purposes.

7. *Ἐγκώμιον* (praise), *Ψόγος* (invective) are included in the progymnastic forms described by the rhetorician Aphthonius. See Kennedy 1983: 60ff.

8. Theon in his introduction to his *Progymnasmata*, refers to such an exercise of paraphrase from Homer (*Il.* 1.593-4). Cf. Webb 1997: 346.

9. Lesky 1966: 830.

10. Bowie (1989: 214) refers to Aristides' hymns as the par excellence paradigm of "prose's annexation of poetry": he explains that while epideictic oratory was closest to poetry, only the *hymn* was coextensive to it, and indeed it was practised as a poetic genre.

11. Lausberg 1998: §35.

Menander (II.393.5ff.), encourages imitation of these poets, since they have praised and blamed many persons παρ' ὧν δυνήσῃ λαβεῖν παραδείγματα.¹² Iambic poetry is considered worthy of imitation when the speaker needs to pass criticism (*ib.* 9ff.). Dio identified the role of both poets and rhetors in bestowing praise: *Or.* XXXII.39 οὔτε τοῖς συνήθως ὕμνοῦσιν αὐτὰ ῥήτορσιν ἢ ποιηταῖς παραβάλλων ἑμαυτόν. δεινοὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ μεγάλοι σοφισταὶ καὶ γόητες.

Sometimes the rivalry between rhetoric and poetry went to the very extreme. Himerius (4th cent. AD) reveals a predilection for poetry which is unexampled in this time.¹³ These speeches pretend to be hymns and lyrics; Himerius feels that he is closer to the poets, especially Sappho and Alcaeus, than to the ancient oratory, his natural model; he viewed poetry as absolutely essential for rhetorical compositions.¹⁴

It is true to say, nevertheless, that although respect for poetry remained high, and by citing poetry in their orations the sophists would lay claim for the true παιδεία of the πεπαιδευμένος that epitomised the ambition of the time, it is prose that had gained the high ground as the medium of expression for oratory and philosophy, which were the primary intellectual activities and the educational vestiges of the time.¹⁵

¹². Menander is keen to recognise that certain genres of epideictic had been invented by poets: the *epithalamium*, in particular, was invented by Sappho while the invention of *συντακτικός* is attributed to Homer. The role of genre in composition of either rhetoric or poetry and their strong correspondence or parallelism between poetic and epideictic genres emphasises the common cultural and educational background to the ancient rhetoric and poetry. Cf. Webb 1997: 341.

¹³. Cf. *Or.* 4.3 the “friend of the divine poet’s chorus”.

¹⁴. In the *protheoria* that accompanied *Or.* 9 (a prose marriage hymn), the sophist explains to his students the treatment he will follow: “Now let the best rule for epithalamia be to look to the *poets* for the *style*,... to the subject for the rhythm. If the speech aims at all of these things, the composition will exhibit considerable *clarity*”.

¹⁵. Maximus of Tyre went so far as to claim that his rhetorical teaching could provide all the skills necessary for the composition of poetry, except for metre; (*Philosophumena* 1.7 Hobein).

4. The 'Nachleben' of Pindar

1. Text

Most of the papyri containing works also transmitted in medieval manuscripts concern only a limited number of authors, those most widely read and studied in Egypt during the Ptolemaic and Roman periods. These were mainly the authors of the “golden age” of Greek literature. There are more than 45 Pindaric papyri (both in roll and codex format), of varying length contributing sometimes large parts of poems relating to different genres, particularly *paean*s and *dithyrambs*. Papyri with Pindaric fragments easily outnumber those of *Epinicians*. The large number of Pindaric fragments confirms what could already be deduced from ancient sources, that is, that Pindar was the pre-eminent Lyric poet in all periods and in all parts of the Greek world, and at all levels from primary school to sophisticated philological studies.

His work was greatly admired and imitated. His poems seem to have found a secure place in the Hellenistic systems of education, which set the pattern for the whole of later antiquity and the Byzantine Middle Ages. Aristarchus and Aristophanes of Byzantium were Alexandrian literary critics who established the first list of “good” authors during an inventory of the Alexandrian library (2nd century BC).¹ Pindar was one of the nine Lyric poets who entered the canon and was regularly lectured on and analysed in *ὑπομνήματα* throughout antiquity.

The first traceable history of Pindaric texts begins with the Alexandrian scholars,² just after the founding of the Alexandrian Library by Ptolemy I. Zenodotus, the first librarian, collected the material³ and later Aristarchus, the great Homeric critic, wrote a commentary, which reflected the mainly grammatical and textual interests of his author.⁴ His commentary is known to us through Didymus, who often cites, and disagrees with Aristarchus in his own commentary which was primarily devoted to historical annotation. Bits and pieces of these *ὑπομνήματα* are saved as *marginalia* in the manuscripts.

But in between the two, the greatest contribution was made by Aristophanes of Byzantium, librarian of the Alexandrian Library from about 195-180 BC, who produced the great Hellenistic edition of Pindar. Aristophanes delved into questions of authenticity and correctness of the text and dealt with metrical problems, and he ordered the poems

¹. Some kind of selection of “worth-while” authors must have been established as early as the third century BC, but we do not know by whom.

². Plato's frequent quoting of Pindar suggests that his poems were already available in book form and we know that some libraries were founded in Athens and Rhodes, which implies the availability of books. Plato's quotes very rarely come from the *Epinicians*. The most famously quoted passage of *fr.* 169a.1-8 “Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς” is of an unknown genre, but certainly not an *Ἑπινίκος*. Records of the epinician must have been kept in the victor's city's annals. On this see Irigoin 1952: 11-28.

³. See Irigoin 1952: 32-3. The scholia preserved some traces of his work.

⁴. *Ibid.* 54-6.

into seventeen books, *i.e.* papyrus rolls. Aristophanes also devised a form of colometry which remained in use in manuscripts and printed books until Boeckh's edition in 1811.

The 'next phase' was the period of Didymus and Theon. In the second century AD, pedagogical utility and literary taste decreed that editions consist of selections only. During this time, a selection took place which determined the tradition of the Greek poets. From the nine poets of the Alexandrian canon –ten if we add Corinna– only two were selected: Sappho from the lyric monody and Pindar from the choral lyric.⁵ A further second selection favours only the *Ἐπίνικοι*.⁶ The selection has to be seen against the background of the philological renaissance manifest in the time of the Antonini, notably with the works of grammarians and lexicographers: Apollonius Dyscolus, Herodianus, and Phrynichus.

The selection of authors is from the outset oriented to the education of the young, even if the criteria for selection are themselves inherent to the language and literature. In Pindar's case *virtus* is again the general criterion.⁷ His reading can serve as an *exemplum* for an individual's action. Ethical considerations made Pindar appropriate as school reading material.

2. Influence in Greek Literature

It is a paradox regarding Pindar's influence in antiquity that he has influenced prose literature as much and perhaps more than poetry. His own genre, choral lyric poetry had died no later than forty years after his own demise and Pindar, along with Bacchylides and Simonides were, minor subsequent attempts notwithstanding, the last practitioners of elaborate choral poetry. His influence is present in later poets, but as prose was becoming, already in the fourth century, the dominant medium, his presence shines no less in works of prose like Plato's, who appears to admire him greatly and quotes him in several places.⁸ The writer in the classical era who was more significantly influenced by Pindar was the orator Isocrates: his eulogy of Evagoras, his treatises to Nikokles and Demonikos and his address of Philip of Macedon are strikingly reminiscent of Pindar's odes to Hieron, as they show, Race points out, "the same blend of praise and counsel, while promoting heroic virtues and Panhellenic ideas".⁹

⁵. Themistios (*Or.* 20 p.236c Hardouin) gives an important testimony for the poets studied in the fourth century education. The two lyric poets studied are Sappho and Pindar, the poets of the selection.

⁶. Irigoien (1952: 94-7) thinks that the selection was probably made in Athens between AD 150 and 180, and that a new commentary was compiled for the text of the selection. The reason for the popularity of *Epinicia* is contained in Eustathius' words (*Opusc.* p.60. 22) that this section of the poet's works was the most popular as being fuller of human interest, less concerned with myth and less obscure in expression,— οἱ καὶ περιάγονται μάλιστα διὰ τὸ ἀνθρωπικώτεροι εἶναι καὶ ὀλιγόμυθοι, καὶ μὴδὲ πᾶντι ἔχειν ἀσαφῶς κατὰ γὰρ τὰ ἄλλα.

⁷. But papyri have finally proved that many of the unselected works were still circulating until late antiquity.

⁸. Cf. des Places 1949.

⁹. Race 1986: 121.

Callimachus (c. 305-240 BC) stands out as a major Hellenistic poet to have been significantly influenced by Pindar.¹⁰ He adopted Pindaric elements in his poetry and he also wrote epinician poems to prominent Egyptians (cf. *fr.* 384 Pf. for Sosibios and a poem celebrating the Nemean chariot victory of Berenike, *Victoria Berenices*). His contemporary Theocritus treats Pindaric subjects, although in entirely different form, using the epic metre of the dactylic hexameter.¹¹

Another line of influence in the Hellenistic literary scene and one most prominently reflected in Callimachus regards Pindar's legacy of "literary criticism". Pindar's pronouncements about his own art foreshadow the language of literary criticism in its more developed stages, reached in the Hellenistic era when a more technical and established terminology had already been coined to describe the art.¹² Here also, Callimachus stands out as reflecting more striking Pindaric influences.¹³

3. Influence in Roman Literature

It is in Rome's greatest lyric poet, Horace, that Pindar found not only an imitator but also an admirer who even felt the need to address exaggerating hymnal praises to his Theban model. It was the time of the Augustan revival of interest in pre-Hellenistic poets which saw Horace drawing upon Greek classical models for his four books of lyric poetry. He stays shy of using triadic choral lyric, for in Latin the result would be too artificial. His subjects are often rather trivial but when he rises to some grandeur, as Quintilian says (*insurgit aliquando IO* 10.1.96) Pindar is often his model. His ode to Augustus borrows from Pindar's opening lines in *Ol. II: quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri* and more interestingly, he adopts Pindar's celebrated philosophical point concerning the relationship between natural talent, training and practice:

*doctrina sed vim promovet insitam,
rectique cultus pectora roborant*

(4.4.33-4)

¹⁰. As a "critic" and as a poet, Callimachus knew and imitated phrases from Pindar's poetry (*e.g.* 480, 597, 384, and in his 'σφραγίς' in *Ap.*). His claim to poetic authority in the Prologue to the *Aetia* is based in part on Pindar's *Paean VIIb* (*fr.* 52h). There Pindar claims to be different from poets who 'go down Homer's worn – road' (l. 11ff.), and that men who do not compose poetry have 'blind hearts' (l.18ff.). Callimachus in his adaptation speaks of finding a path that is not only untrodden but narrow; then he describes *himself* in terms of Pindar's art, as the 'slight one, the winged' (23ff.). For Pindar as a model for the *second* and *third* hymns of Callimachus, see Lord 1990.

¹¹. *E.g.* Theocritus' Panegyric to Hieron II (*Idyl.* 16), and Ptolemy (*Idyl.* 17). Most striking is his reference to Heracles' strangulation of the snakes in *Idyl.* 24, a topic treated by Pindar in *Nem. I*. Theocritus treats the subjects as independent small showpieces and not as parts of hymnal songs. This preference is a characteristic of the Hellenistic poetry generally.

¹². Richardson 1985: 383-401; Verdenius 1983: 14-59.

¹³. Richardson shows that while in other cases in the Hellenistic 'formally established' criticism Pindar's presence has to do more with some fundamental assumptions about Greek poetry shared by Pindar and other poets, in the case of Callimachus one may speak of *influence* by Pindar. Callimachus is singled out as more strikingly exemplifying the presence of the Pindaric element of the search for appropriateness in Hellenistic poetry, as well his view of poems as "intricate works of craftsmanship".

The most striking manifestation of Horace's debt to Pindar is offered in his praise to his model lyric poet in the first verses of *Odes* 4.2, which begins with his name: *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari...* (Whoever strives to emulate Pindar, Iulus, relies on wings held together with wax through Daedalus' craft, and is bound to give his name to a transparent sea).

But Horace continues in the subsequent five stanzas to give a poetic description of Pindar's technique:

*Monte decurrens velut amnis imbres
quem super notas aluere ripas,
fervet immensusque ruit profundo
Pindarus ore.*

(Od. 4.2)

The ode is the familiar form of *recusatio*, a literal refusal to write in the grand style, which he attributes to Pindar in an exaggerated form, to the point of caricature as it transpires with the technique of the *recusationes*. However, the image of Pindar as a poet who rages like a rushing river with no restraint exerted great influence from the Renaissance on and is responsible for giving a rather misleading aspect of Pindar.

Another Roman writer on whom Pindar exerted great influence was Quintilian, who, in his famous account of Greek and Latin literature finds that of the nine Greek lyric poets, Pindar is by far the greatest:

Novem vero lyricorum longe Pindarus princeps, spiritus magnificentia, sententiis, figuris, beatissima rerum verborumque copia et velut quodam eloquentiae flumine; propter quae Horatius eum merito credidit nemini imitabilem.

(Quint. IO 10.1.61).

But Quintilian's views on Pindar we will examine in the context of Pindar's legacy in the history of Oratory.

4. In the specific area of the second century culture and society

Pindar reached the height of his popularity in the Imperial age. This is a consequence of the *imitatio* of classical models. In the second century AD people looked back to their spiritual ancestors in search for literary and stylistic models. This tendency can also be observed in the early Ptolemaic period. Hellenistic scholarship was particularly concerned to establish what was classical in poetry and oratory. The same practice may have resurfaced in the second century AD and people concentrated on what they regarded as good models, both stylistically and poetically. The two main tendencies of that period were to regenerate the past and to return to the classical authors.

As more restricted canons of what was “classical” came to be accepted by scholars and teachers, Pindar's works were held in favour, and the habit of treating ‘Pindar’ as a school text continued in western Europe during the Renaissance and after.

5. In O R A T O R Y

Second century rhetoricians hold Pindar in high esteem. Pindar is one of the most eminent poets that Quintilian selects for consideration. Of the nine lyric poets received into the 'canon' Quintilian recommends only four: Pindar, Stesichorus, Alcaeus, and Simonides (*IO* 10.1.61). These are the same as those criticised by Dionysius Halicarnassensis, except that in the latter Simonides comes next after Pindar (*de imitat. fr.* 31, 2, 5).

Ζηλωτὸς δὲ καὶ Πίνδαρος ὀνομάτων καὶ νοημάτων εἵνεκα, καὶ μεγαλοπρεπείας καὶ τόνου καὶ περιουσίας κατασκευῆς καὶ δυνάμεως, καὶ πικρίας μετὰ ἡδονῆς· καὶ πυκνότητος καὶ σεμνότητος, καὶ γνωμολογίας καὶ ἐναργείας, καὶ σχηματισμῶν καὶ ἡθοποιίας καὶ αὐξήσεως καὶ δεινώσεως· μάλιστα δὲ τῶν εἰς σωφροσύνην καὶ εὐσέβειαν καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν ἡθῶν.

Both accounts acknowledge rhetorical virtues in Pindar's diction. His distinctive quality stressed is *magnificentia*, μεγαλοπρέπεια: he is φιλάγλαος, 'splendour-loving'. A great number of Pindar's metaphors illustrate his μεγαλοπρέπεια. To cite just one example, the architectural imagery that opens *Pyth.* VII seems to be built on the ideal of μεγαλοπρέπεια as a system mutually advantageous to the *oikos* and the *polis*.

Dio Chrysostomus (2, 33) also praises Pindar's λαμπρότης in celebrating great men and he presents the commander who united all Greece against the Persians and who venerated Homer as having appreciated the Panhellenic Theban poet. Philostratus in *VA* 6.26 refers to Pindar's ability to bestow his praise κατὰ σοφίαν.

Aristides, like other orators of his time, delivered epideictic speeches which are essentially praise speeches. He saw Pindar close enough to his rhetorical needs of praise. He felt an affinity to the way that Pindar formulated his praise.

In a song of praise we expect certain data about the victor, such as his name, the name of his father, and his home. Pindar is able to provide the necessary information unobtrusively and without repeating himself. Other factors which form the stock-in-trade of a victory ode include *myth*, *proverbs*, *gnomae*, and so forth. These are the strands which are inextricably woven into a whole; they emerge, they vanish, to make room for another motif, and come again into view, tracing a complex pattern of parallels and contrasts. These fibres of Pindar's poem are distributed over its length creating an ornate tapestry. Such material was of great importance for the needs of an epideictic speech.¹⁴ Thus, Pindaric material appears to be a valuable source for an orator who wanted to give a *mythological exemplum*, or to cite a *gnome* with which everyone would be prepared to agree. Dionysius in *Ars Rhetorica* expounds how epideictic forms of rhetoric were a

¹⁴. Cf. Aristid. *Ars rhetorica*, 1.9.1.4 Sp.: Γλυκύτης δὲ γίνεται καθολικῶς τριχῇ, κατὰ γνώμην, κατὰ σχῆμα, κατὰ ἀπαγγελίαν. κατὰ μὲν γνώμην οὕτως, ὅταν τις ταῖς ἐξωθεν ἐπινοίαις χρῆται, οἷον ἐξ ἱστοριῶν καὶ παροιμιῶν καὶ μύθων.

collection of commonplaces (τόποι) laid out for the pupil – a considerable number of them coming from Pindar's odes.¹⁵ Poetic *gnome* and *chreia* were progymnastic forms.¹⁶

Excerpts from his works were included in later anthologies. Phrases proverbial in effect and sententious thoughts is what authors usually take from an anthology. Such material was useful as an aid to rhetorical compositions.

Pindar in his odes makes use of specific rhetorical techniques for which he could be appreciated in rhetorical practice, and a number of scholars have already called attention to such techniques employed by Pindar.¹⁷

'*recusatio*': Pindar in *Olympian one* asserts that his account of the traditional myth will be different from that of earlier poets. The demands of encomiastic poetry and of rhetoric are identical in the sense that both seek to convince the audience of the truth of what the speaker says, and Pindar, if he is to convince his audience that his version of the myth is true, must remove all credibility of the traditional version. Pindar's elaborate *recusatio* of the traditional myth is based on the conviction that one should not speak ill of the gods (cf. *fr.* 81). Apart from the ostensible religiosity it expresses, the *recusatio* can also be analysed as a purely poetic or rhetorical device.

Although his *Ἐπίνικοί* praise victorious individuals they are also useful in offering prefabricated modes and techniques of praise for the *laudandus*' polis. The city is included in the praise which takes the form of "*praise of the victor's homeland*", as Thummer categorises it.¹⁸ Pindar had a high sense of the 'measure' of his praise, scrupulously avoiding to reach the point of 'κόρος' and thereby to cause the 'φθόνος' and the dissatisfaction of the audience.¹⁹ In doing so, he uses a number of strategies:

a. He incorporates the polis into the praise of the victor: thus, the poem is designated as "κόσμος" (*Nem.* VI.46 κοσμεῖν), or good for the entire polis.

b. He further glorifies the city through his praise of its mythical heroes and through the narration of foundation myths.²⁰

Such techniques of praise were important to the rhetorical practice in praising and commemorating an individual's noble deeds in connection to his native polis.

¹⁵. Cf. Kennedy 1972: 636. It would be quite natural for sophistic rhetors to measure their accomplishments against the "master's" model, albeit reverently and implicitly.

¹⁶. Cf. Kennedy 1983: 61 nos. 3, 4.

¹⁷. Cf. the most detailed study by Race (1990) on the subtle interplay between style, rhetoric, and colometry as a regular feature of Pindar's verse. His work differs from other studies on style by concentrating "on the rhetorical purpose served by each stylistic feature under discussion"; (cf. Race 1990: 5).

¹⁸. For examples see Thummer 1968-69: vol.I. 55-65.

¹⁹. That the victor's fellow citizens feel 'φθόνος' at his good fortune and excessive praise is an epinician commonplace. On the topic see Bundy 1986: 40, Thummer 1968-69: vol.I. 80-1, and Stoneman 1976: 191-2.

²⁰. These are political myths which transform an entire city into a single family descended from a common mythic ancestor (e.g. Helios and Rhodes in *Ol.* VII); Aristides does the same in *Or.* XX (Smyrna). See Kurke (1990: ch.8), for a discussion of Pindar's strategies.

5.1. Aristides' Quotations from Classical Authors.

In the flourishing period of the second sophistic, Aristides distinguished himself not as an extempore orator, but as a the master of the artistic oration, the carefully prepared declamation. He was deeply imbued with the history and the literature of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. His writings are full of quotations from authors of all the periods of early and classical literature, showing a highly erudite man as well as his broad literary interests.

Aristides was a follower of Isocrates and, like him, he claimed the whole of education for himself. He shows a familiarity with both poetry and prose, which is apparent in his frequent citations, innumerable allusions, and stylistic borrowings.

Aristides excerpted the classical texts in search of notable expressions, in order to buttress his arguments with selective extracts from Greek poetry, whether to prove the primacy of rhetoric as well as its character as a *techne*, or to oppose Plato's devaluation of *The Four* (: Pericles, Themistocles, Miltiades, Kimon). This variegated picture from the use of quotations appears also in Panegyrics on cities, various prose-hymns, open letters or miscellaneous speeches for special occasions, aiming mainly at an exhibition of knowledge.¹

The wide spectrum of his quotations reflects the preoccupation of the contemporary schools with cultivating the tastes of their audiences with what best could be treasured in Hellenism, seen and expounded in a unifying, recollective or “summing up” way.² Aristides had a passionate devotion to literature, not only to the great masters of verse and prose from the early and classical periods but to lesser figures like Aeschines Socraticus.

Instructive for an appreciation of Aristides' predilections in early and classical authors is the *Or.* XXVIII (“concerning a remark in passing”). In this boastful work Aristides justifies an incidental comment in praise of himself dropped while delivering a prose-hymn.³ The first section of the speech, (§§18-97) after the introduction, is a catalogue of instances of *self-encomium* in Greek literature.

Extracts are culled from almost all the major genres of classical literature, and figure in every paragraph, so that a reading of the speech brings one into the milieu of the higher education of the second century. The quotations start from Homer and go down to

¹. *Ors.* I, II, III, and XXVIII are similar in tone, style, and use of citations, all of which except *Or.* III were composed in the same period (Cathedra).

². Kennedy (1972: 564-5), explains most succinctly this “summing-up”, recollective spirit of the age of the last sophists: “Aristides’ (and Dio’s) speeches may be said to sum up the moral and historical achievement of Hellenism and to project it in a splendid panorama before the Graeco-Roman world. The sophists thus contributed to unifying and expounding the culture of their age in somewhat the same way that the emperor Hadrian unified and amplified the arts of architecture and sculpture”.

³. Cf the introduction to *Or.* XXVIII, p.279. For a more detailed discussion cf. Rutherford 1995.

Demosthenes, including nothing after him. Among the examples from **Homeric poetry** the passage about the “*blind old man of Chios*” at the end of the *h. Hom. Ap.*, is of special interest, since Aristides assumes it to be Homer's self-description.

From **Lyric poetry** Aristides quotes Sappho (§51), Alcman (§§51-4), and Pindar (§§55-8); then he turns to the **epigram** citing a series of Simonides' epigrams (§§59-67).

After poetry, Aristides –omitting tragedy and New Comedy–, turns to **history** (§§68-74), **oratory** (§§75-9) (particularly *D. De Corona*), and **philosophy** (§§80-3).⁴ Then he passes to the **oratory** of the Athenian and Theban generals Iphicrates and Epaminondas (§§84-8). From the fine arts he refers to **painters** (§§88-90); and then back to **literature** and **comic poets** (§§91-4); and then **Isocrates**, *Panegyricus* (§§95-7). Finally, he expresses an observation on the dramatic *Parabasis*.

The sequence and the structure of Aristides' quotations in this speech is of great importance, since for the section (§§ 18-83) the orator follows closely the reading-list in Quintilian *IO* 10.1, and Dio of Prusa, *Or. XVIII* (περὶ λόγων ἀσκήσεως):

1. *poetry*,
2. *history*,
3. *oratory*, and
4. *philosophy*.⁵

In order to obtain an overall view of the range of Aristides' reading and interests in classical Greek literature, I append a tabulation of the quotations and reminiscences that are preserved throughout in his orations, except those he cited from Plato and Pindar.⁶

⁴ Aristides focuses on the arrogance that Socrates shows in his *Apology*.

⁵ Dionysius in his manual *περὶ μιμήσεως* 2, changes the successive order of the last two. Cf. Rutherford 1995: 196 n.13.

⁶ The formation of the list was primarily based on the data provided by Behr 1968a: 11-2 n. 29. I have supplemented Behr's list accordingly.

5.2. Index of Poets and Authors Quoted by Aristides

Epic Poets:

- Homerus**
Ilias(253)
Odyssea(93)
Hesiodus
Theogonia(15)
Opera et Dies(13)
Hymnus Homericus III.....(3)
Cypria.....(2)
Nosti.....(1)
Aratus(3)

Lyric Poets:

- Alcaeus**.....(4)
Alcman.....(7)
Archilochus.....(7)
Arion.....(1)
Philoxenus(1)
Sappho(3)
Scolion(3)
Semonides(1)
Simonides(2)
Solon(6)
Stesichorus(6)
Terpander(1)
Timocreon(1)
Tyrtaeus.....(2?)

Epigrams:

- Parrhasius**(1)
Simonides.....(12)
Zeuxis(1)
Orphica.....(1)
Anonymous Poets.....(1)

Tragic Poets:

- Aeschylus**
Persae.....(1)
Prometheus Vincitus.....(1)
Septem contra Thebas.....(2)
Fragmenta(6)
Sophocles
Ajax(3)
Oedipus Tyrannus(3)
Oedipus Coloneus.....(2)
Philoctetes(3)
Satyri ('Ελένης γάμος)(1)
Fragmenta(4)
Euripides
Andromache.....(1)
Antiope(2)
Helena(1)
Heraclidae.....(1)
Hippolytus(3)
Iphigenia Taurica.....(1)
Medea.....(1)
Phoenissae(2)
Polydus.....(1)
Protesilaus.....(1)
Troades(2)
Fragmenta.....(12)
Unidentified Tragic Frs.... (4)

Comic Poets:

- Aristophanes**
Acharnenses(9)
Aves(2)
Equites.....(2)
Lysistrata(2)
Nubes(14)
Plutus(1)
Ranae(6)
Telmessenses(1)
Vespae.....(5)
Fragmenta(3)
Cratinus(6)
Eupolis.....(7)
Plato Comicus.....(1)
Alexis(1)
Menander.....(6)
Unidentified Comic Frs.....(4)

Other philosophers:

- Aeschines Socraticus**.....(9)
Anaximenes(1)
Antisthenes(1)
Aristoteles(7)
Diogenes Apolloniates.....(1)
Empedocles.....(1)
Musonius(1)

Historians and Biographers:

- Aesopus**.....(5)
Anaximenes.....(1)
Ephorus(6)
Hecataeus(1)
Herodotus.....(155)
Hippocrates.....(1)
Plutarchus*
Moralia.....(3)
Vitae Parallelae.....(85)
Theopompus(1)
Thucydides(182)
Xenophon
Anabasis(3)
Cynegeticus(2)
Institutio Cyri (Cyropaedia)..(2)
Historia Graeca (Hellenica)..(47)
Memorabilia(3)
de Vectigalibus(1)

Orators:

- Aeschines**.....(6)
Demosthenes.....(111)
Dinarchus(1)
Hyperides(1)
Isocrates.....(38)
Lysias.....(11)

*. Behr (Aristides 1986: vol.I. 528-9), cautiously notes: "despite many close parallels between Plutarch and Aristides, because of some striking differences, I very much doubt that Aristides used Plutarch. I suspect that they both employed a common source, probably Ephorus".

This table illustrates Aristides' interests in classical literature. The reading of these authors should not be assigned entirely to his education since there is a number of them whom he manifestly starts quoting in mid-career.⁷

Homer - Lyrics

With regard to the sources of poetic quotations, the great majority are from Homer. *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were read complete in schools with the grammaticus. The papyrus fragments favour the *Iliad*. Homer was fundamental to the aspiring rhetor.⁸ I find 346 instances cited as against 297 from other poets.⁹

The reading lists in Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Statius (*Silv.* V 3.146-58), Sextus Empiricus (*Adv. Gramm.* I 3.58-9) and Dionysius Thrax (I 1) suggest that Lyric was read immediately after epic. Pindar, Stesichorus, Alcaeus, and Simonides are recommended by Quintilian (*IO* 10.1.61-4), and Dionysius Halicarnassensis.

Aristides preserved a considerable number of citations from Lyric poetry;¹⁰ among them Pindar holds a predominant position in terms of frequency of citation. I find 71 instances of his actual words cited, with or without ascription, as against 45 from other Lyrics (remarkably none from Ibycus, Anacreon, and Bacchylides)¹¹. Thus, even if we exclude the special passages in *Or.* II (§§109-12; 226-31), which give us 10 (: 5+5) Pindaric citations (as well as references besides) in a short space, Pindar would still exceed all the other Lyric poets together.

The quotations from Pindar exceed in number those from the works of Tragic [about 71 to 58], and Comic poets [about 71 to 70].¹²

Tragedy

The poetry of the three major Tragedians is represented with a fair number of quotations. Unquestionably Euripides was the principal representative of this branch of poetry, who was read for his rhetorical qualities. Aristides' testimony agrees with that of papyri: thus we have about 30 papyri for Aeschylus, 20 for Sophocles, and no fewer than 85 for Euripides, including at least 40 mainly short fragments from lost plays.¹³

7. For the period AD 154-164 when Aristides resumes his profession in full scale, starts quoting the following authors: the poets Philoxenus, Terpander, Timocreon and Plato Comicus; the orators Dinarchus and Hyperides; Anaximenes; Theopompus and fragments from *Nosti* and *Orphica*. Quotations from Alexis, Hippocrates, Antisthenes, Empedocles, and Musonius appear in last period of his career (AD 165-189). The above all authors are represented with no more than one quotation.

8. Quintilian (*IO* 10.1.46ff.), begins his reading list with his praise to Homer presenting him as an unrivalled model for every department of eloquence, noting that he has displayed all the rules of art to be followed in forensic or deliberative oratory; Hermogenes makes him master of all types of oratory.

9. On Aristides' knowledge of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* see Kindstrand 1973: 85-7.

10. In Aristides' quotations from Iambic poetry are almost absent Hippon. and Semon.; Plutarch does the same (Castagna 1991:165-6).

11. Aristides' failure to quote Bacchylides almost certainly indicates that he was not read in grammar school.

12. The numerical preponderance of Pindar over Aristophanes is indisputable.

13. Gallo 1986: 52 with n.14.

Comedy

Aristides knew Aristophanes' plays in their entirety. The number of 45 quotations shows Aristides' predilection for Aristophanes' plays, of course at the expense of other comic poets; *Nubes* and *Acharnenses* seem to have appealed most to the orator. We have also quotations from Menander, Cratinus, Eupolis and other comic poets.

Aristides' preference for Old Comedy flies in the face of papyri finds. Comedy is one of the literary genres best attested in papyri, though there are fewer for Aristophanes, and for Old and Middle Comedy in general, while the number for New Comedy, and especially for Menander, is very impressive.

Philosophy

Aristides being a fervent supporter of the art of oratory, went back to the old controversy between philosophy and rhetoric vying for precedence in the education of the young. This principle is further reflected in the lesser number of his citations from philosophers. The case of Aeschines Socraticus seems to be rather exceptional, and Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was part of rhetoric studies.

Plato

Aristides' thorough familiarity with Plato, and especially with the text of *Gorgias*, is so extensive that in Byzantine times (esp. 13th cent.), a text of the *Gorgias* was included sometimes in his works.¹⁴ Aristides was particularly keen to reject the opinion which Plato had expressed in his *Gorgias*, where he denied the usefulness of rhetoric as an educational medium.

Platonic Quotations in Aristides					
No. of Qs.:	1-2	3-9	12-201		
	<i>Amatores</i> (1)	<i>Critias</i> (3)	<i>Timaeus</i> (12)		
	<i>Axiochus</i> (1)	<i>Politicus</i> (3)	<i>Protagoras</i> (18)		
	<i>Epistle II.</i> (1)	<i>Theages</i> (3)	<i>Apology</i> (21)		
	<i>Euryxias</i> (1)	<i>Cratylus</i> (4)	<i>Symposium</i> (24)		
	<i>Lysis</i> (1)	<i>Euthydemus</i> (4)	<i>Menexenus</i> (37)		
	<i>Epinomis</i> (2)	<i>Epistle VII.</i> (5)	<i>Phaedrus</i> (39)		
	<i>Epistle III.</i> (2)	<i>Theaetetus</i> (5)	<i>Laws</i> (55)		
	<i>Laches</i> (2)	<i>Alcibiades I.</i> (9)	<i>Republic</i> (70)		
	<i>Parmenides</i> (2)	<i>Epistle VIII.</i> (9)	<i>Gorgias</i> (201)		
		<i>Phaedo</i> (9)			

History - Biography

Classical historians and orators attracted Aristides' interest in his declamations on themes of classical history.¹⁵ It is noteworthy that Aristides does not confine himself to a restricted number of historic compositions from an author, but his quotations cover the majority of their transmitted corpus. The works of Herodotus, Thucydides, and

¹⁴. *Vaticanus Graecus* 933 and *Parisinus Graecus* 2953, are among the oldest Mss of Aristides that contained a copy of *Gorgias*, cf. Dodds 1990: 64.

¹⁵. Cf. *Ors.* I, III, VII-XV.

Xenophon were studied in detail, whereas the compositions of Ephorus, Hecataeus, Theopompus seems to have been consulted only for specific purposes (*e.g. Egyptian discourse, Roman oration*). The majority of his quotations from Plutarch comes from the *Vitae*.

Oratory

The profusion of quotations from Demosthenes indicates a thorough knowledge of the Athenian orator, who formed for Aristides an unrivalled model.¹⁶ Forty quotations from Isocrates place him among Aristides' favourite orators of the past, whereas the majority of his quotations from Lysias are from his fragmentarily preserved works. From the three or more references to Aeschines, Dinarchus, and Hyperides one can infer that Aristides looked at the original text afresh.

5.3. The form and the function of Pindaric quotations in Aristides

The forms in which quotations from Pindar are given can be separated into three types:

1. <direct citation>: Passages (ranging in length from 1 word or 2 to 6-8 lines) cited correctly and verbatim—often introduced, for example, by ὅτι or again with parenthetical insertion of (*e.g.*) φησί or γάρ.¹⁷

2. <paraphrase, proverbial phrases, allusion, reminiscence>: Passages in which the poet's own words (cited correctly or not) are adapted to the syntax of Aristides' sentence, sometimes in violation of metre.¹⁸

3. Passages incorrectly cited, but recognisable as quotations, or mere references to poet's name.¹⁹

In establishing the various types of quotations, we may find the following ones:

Aristides uses quotations sometimes as *integral* to his argument, sometimes as a mere *embellishment*. The two types are not always easy to distinguish; any quotation usually occurs as in some degree appropriate or relevant to the context of discussion, and may well supply a case in point. [But there is an obvious difference between, for example,

¹⁶. In *Or.* IV.3-5 Aristides mentions that he had composed already a speech *πρὸς Λεπτινήν* looking through the corresponding speech of Demosthenes -which had in his hands- for useful arguments.

¹⁷. Aristides following the tradition, does not refer by στίχοι to the works of Pindar, although there is frequent occurrence of stichometric numbering in papyri in both prose and verse (*e.g.* Diogenes Laertius *VP* 7.187-8 refers by στίχοι to Chrysippus). Cf. Devreese 1954: 331, *s.v.* Stichométrie; Pasquali 1962:188; Turner 1977: 78; Cavallo-Maehler 1987: no.31c. Aristides rarely names his sources. He holds that it is amusing for his reader to identify the quotation, cf. Boulanger 1923: 397.

¹⁸. Cf. Hermog. *Id.* II, 4 ὥστε ἐν δοκεῖν εἶναι σῶμα αὐτῶν τε (*i.e.* quotations) καὶ τοῦ πεζοῦ λόγου.

¹⁹. In four cases Aristides refers to Pindar by name in connection to another poet or writer.

the extended use and application of verses from Homer in *Or.* II.413-4, and the exceptional passage in *id.* 226ff., where quotation and criticism of Pindar is essential to the argument].

Aristides gleaned Pindar along with other classical works for the following reasons:²⁰

1. Aristides was himself interested in Pindar's pronouncements about the nature of his own art. Pindaric statements quoted in Aristides are primarily functional in the sense that they fulfil a rhetorical purpose within the particular contexts of the speech. At the same time their impressiveness is partly due to their gnomic character: they appear to be the distillation of the poet's own theory on poetry and his view of the world and thus to have a significance reaching far beyond their immediate context.

2. *Authority*: the quotation supports a statement of Aristides as a sort of tangible *proof* increasing the cogency of the argument.²¹

3. *Illustration - comparison*: these are two very effective types of argument; the quotation gives an example²² (mythological) or an *ἐνθύμημα*, inviting a comparison of the situation in Aristides with that in its original context.

4. *Ornamentation*:²³ Aristides interlaced his orations with masterpieces from Pindar's poetry for decorative purposes, and to display his erudition. The ancient rhetoric deals with the literary quote, which is a stylistic element. Hermogenes considers the poetic quotations as an element of *γλυκύτης* (*Id.* I, 1; II, 4).

5. *Incidental*: the quotation forms part of an anecdote told for its own sake.

6. The seriousness of Pindar, his deep religious commitment appealed to Aristides.

* * *

Aristides is the sole source for 19 quotations and the fundamental one for another 16 from Pindar.

The distribution of the Pindaric quotations in Aristides' speeches is as follows:

1. In 13 *orations*, quotations from Pindar feature more than twice: *Ors.* I (2); II (11); III (8); XVII (3); XX (3?); XXI (2); XXV (2); XXVIII (4); XXXIV (4); XLI (2); XLIII (2); XLV (11); L (4).

2. Pindar is quoted once in the following *Ors.*: XXIII; XXIV; XXVI; XXVII; XXX; XXXI; XXXII; XXXIII; XXXVI; XXXVII; XXXVIII; XXXIX; XLII; XLIV; and XLVI.

A small portion of the quotations and allusions from *Ἐπίνικοι* comes either from the opening lines or near the first lines. A slightly bigger portion comes from the end of the respective texts:

20. **Bompaire** (1958: 385), distinguishes the quotations as: stylistique (*ornans*) - logique (autorité) - compliments - polémiques.

21. **Arisoteles** (*rhet* I, 15, 13), ranks quotations in *ἄτεχνοι pisteis*.

22. These examples were often “κρίσις ἀπὸ ἐνδόξων προσώπων” (Spengel I, 423).

23. **Boulanger** 1923: 447.

<i>Initium carminis</i>	<i>Finis carminis</i>
<i>Ol.</i> II.1-2 = <i>Hieros Logos</i> 4 (50).31K	<i>Ol.</i> II.86-8 = <i>Ors.</i> II.109; XXVIII.55
III.11ff. = <i>Or.</i> XLV.3	IX.100-2 = II.110
VII.7 = XXXIX.16	<i>Pyth.</i> II.94-5,96 = II.230
	VIII.95 = I.148
	<i>Isth.</i> VIII.61 = XLV.13

Aristides' exploitation of material that comes from the so-called *ἔργον εἰς Θεούς* follows a similar pattern, although the fragmentary state of this section of Pindar's work does not allow any definite conclusions: four quotations fall within the first lines:

- *Pae.* VI.1-6 = *Or.* XXVIII.58
- *fr.* 75.14 = *Or.* XLVI.25
- 76.2 = *Ors.* I.9, 124, 401; VIII.21; XX.13
- 169a.1-8 = *Or.* II.226

* * *

In defining Aristides' technique in quoting Pindar we can observe the following:

I. Often we are reminded of the original context (ἐν ὕμνοις Π. μέμνηται).²⁴ In a few cases lines are given without acknowledgement to Pindar. As a rule, Pindar is referred to by name in compositions dating throughout Aristides' career. A comparative examination of his speeches shows that Aristides' references to Pindar by name seem to be more frequent in his early orations and especially in those dating from the time of Cathedra (AD 145-147).

For the last two periods of his life (*i.e.* AD 154-164, and AD 165-189), Aristides shows an increased predilection for citing extracts from Pindar without acknowledging their authorship.²⁵ This preference to claim vague authority in his quotes was common at his time (especially in Lucian).²⁶ Thus, a number of his quotes are introduced with the phrase ὥς / ὅτι οἱ ποιηταὶ φασὶν (or λέγουσι / καλοῦσι). Aristides probably expected his audience / reader to recognise that the quoted lines were Pindar's.

In the major polemic treatises against Plato (*Ors.* II, III), references to Pindar are always made by name.²⁷

In the orations composed in praise of ancient cities, Pindaric quotations are given without acknowledgement to Pindar, or they are introduced with the stereotyped phrase

²⁴. Aristides here follows an already established tradition: *e.g.* Str.VII, *fr.* 58 ὥς φησιν ἐν τοῖς Ὑμνοῖς Πίνδαρος, cf. Irigoin 1952: 37. Aristides calls Pindar's odes μέλος / λόγος.

²⁵. Cf. *Ors.* XVII.3, 4; XXI.10; XXXVIII.12; XLI.6; XLV.3.

²⁶. Cf. Bompaire 1958: 403 with n.4.

²⁷. Aristides prefers occasionally to refer to an author by a periphrasis, often involving his πατρίς. Cf. *Or.* II.109 ποιητοῦ... ἀπὸ Βοιωτίας καὶ Ἑλικῶνος (Pindar); *Or.* III.97 Κεῖος ποιητῆς (Simonides); *Or.* XXVIII.51 Λακωνικὸς ποιητῆς (Alcman).

(ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ποιηταί). Exceptions seem to be *Or.* XXVII.2 (Cyzicos) and his third quote in the *Rhodian oration* (XXV).

Pindar's name is clearly stated in *Ors.* XXXII.34 and XXXI.12, both composed for individuals, whereas it is concealed in his quotation in the *birthday speech to Apellas*.

Aristides' prose-hymns appear in more variegated forms: Pindar is referred to by name in *Ors.* XXXVII.6; XXXIX.16; XLI.6; XLII.12 and XLIII.30, without name in the rest of them.

2. Aristides' usual practice is to cite Pindar after Homer. He prefers occasionally to accumulate a number of direct quotations either from a poet or a group of poets. This is the case in *Or.* II, where Aristides quotes 17 extracts from Homer in (§§85-95) and 5 from Pindar within four paragraphs (109-12), (cf. *Or.* III.109ff.). In *Or.* XXVIII a sequence of Pindaric quotations is interlaced with fragments from Alcman, Sappho, and Simonides, whereas in *Or.* XXX.16 the words of Pindar and Euripides are incorporated in one quote.

3. It is customary for Aristides to give in paraphrase parts of Pindar's poetry mainly concerned with various mythological accounts, which in the context of his argument function as *mythological exempla*, and by these means Aristides attempts to draw a parallel between his own point and Pindar's views; (a clear example for that can be supplied in his paraphrase of *fr.* *31).

4. *Dialectal simplification*: Aristides usually transcribes a Doric form into the corresponding one of κοινή, or simplifies component adjectives (cf. *fr.* 75.14), to suit the needs of readers for whom the odes were becoming increasingly archaic, remote, and consequently hard to understand.²⁸ However, he makes only such changes as will not greatly impair the value of his evidence, avoiding in that way negligence and lack of scruple.

5. As a rule, Aristides avoids long verbatim quotations.²⁹ If he wanted to use more than two, rarely three, verses, he paraphrased part of the passage (cf. *fr.* 169a; *fr.* 32),³⁰ or broke up the quotation into several shorter ones (cf. *Pyth.* II.94-6; *fr.* 194). Although this technique is followed rarely, it serves as a formula of smooth transition saving Aristides from a long digression.

6. *Φέρε δὴ γνώρισον καὶ ταῦτα, εἰ ἄρα οἶός τε εἶ* (i.e. Pindar):

The audience / reader is challenged occasionally to recognise the authorship and the meaning of the quoted extract. Aristides perhaps finds it amusing to make the reader

²⁸. Imperial Age authors quote freely also in order to avoid the charge of pedantry. Accuracy in citing is demanded in technical works. (Bompaire 1958: 395 with n.2).

²⁹. Proclus says of the poetic quotations, οὐκ εἰς μῆκος αὐτὰ ἀποτείνειν προσήκει (in Alc. 292.3 Creuzer).

³⁰. For a similar practice cf. Max. Tyr. *Or.* 27.7, who quotes *Il.* 2.204 and paraphrases the previous line.

recall the author's name from his memory bank. In *Or.* XXVIII.55 we are asked to identify Pindar's authorship in series of quotations: “*come now, recognise this too, if you are able*”, and further on ὁ ποιητής, ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτός ἐστιν (*ibid*); it is the next paragraph where we are told the poet's name. A good instance illustrating this technique is his quotation from the well known introduction of Isocrates' *Panegyricus* in *Or.* XXVIII.95 ἐξέτασον τίς ἦν ὁ ... ἐπαινέσας.³¹ Aristides shows this predilection in order to impress and to catch his audience's attention and interest.

7. Aristides occasionally identifies the position of the quoted lines within the corpus of the poem (cf. *Pae.* VI.1-6), or he acknowledges the natural sequence of two quotations when they come from the same ode.

8. In a sequence of Pindaric quotations the earlier items prepare the ground for the final one with which we reach a crescendo. This technique is well illustrated in *Ors.* II and XXVIII.

9. Aristides rarely cites Pindar's words as his own, eliminating whatever might betray their origin (cf. *frs.* 75.14; 76).

³¹. Cf. *Or.* XXVIII.67 ἐξέτασον (Sim. *fr.* 46B).

6. Aristides' Sources for his Quotations from Pindar.

Aristides was an astonishingly erudite man. His speeches are interlaced with an immense amount of literary quotations giving the impression of a kaleidoscopic compilation: «Zitatenmosaiken», paraphrases, and word-mingling from poetry.

However, Aristides himself does not give any information on the origin of his literary sources, and therefore the following sources for his quotations from Pindar must be considered mainly as proposals for discussion.

1. Original Edition of Pindar

Pindar's writings were collected, arranged, and edited in the great Library at Alexandria by distinguished scholars and writers, the chief part being taken probably by Aristophanes of Byzantium.³² This collection, made in the 3rd century BC, comprised 17 books, of which but four survive complete.

Aristides knew more of Pindar than a modern reader does. In his time the Alexandrian edition of Pindar was still circulated. He was conversant with the whole of Pindar's works:

a. 3/4 of his quotations come from the books lost to us, which Aristides knew equally well as the *Epinicians*.

b. His quotations cover almost all types and modes of Pindaric composition,³³ and these are not taken from a secondary source but are of independent authority.

c. He lived before the time when the selection of Pindar's works had been made for educational purposes. This inevitably resulted in a great loss, and after the 3rd century AD only the *Epinicians* were read.³⁴ This is clear in the following table:³⁵

	<i>Epinic. Fragm.</i>			<i>Epinic. Fragm.</i>	
Dio Chrysost.	–	4	Philostr. <i>imag.</i>	25	3
Apoll. Dysc.	4	7	Himer.	5	3
Lucian.	3	7	Liban.	13	4
Pausan.	8	16	Greg. Naz.	9	1
Clem. Alex.	5	21	Chor. Gaz.	30	3

³². According to Irigoin (1952: 32-3), Zenodotus drew up a "pre-archetype", the so-called *Ἐδάφια* or *κείμενα βάσειως*, based on local editions of Pindar and private collections. Callimachus divided and classified the text in his *πίνακες*, but the first edition belongs to Aristophanes. The text was annotated successively by Aristarchus and others, and these scholia were epitomised by Didymus.

³³. Aristides does not quote from the extant *Προσόδια*, *Παρθένεια* and *Ἐγκώμια*.

³⁴. The *Epinicians* serve as school texts during antiquity and Middle Ages. Cf. Irigoin 1952: 96ff.

³⁵. The provided statistics are based on Maehler's *index fontium*.

Aristides did not quote always directly from Pindar's text and in the few instances he did, this was due to the seriousness of the point he discussed. In these cases he shows more accuracy although he, like Plutarch, appears rather careless in transcribing connectives. It is probable that Aristides had an edition of Pindar to hand in the following cases:

• <i>Ol.</i> IX.27-9, 100-2	=	<i>Or.</i> II.110
• <i>Ol.</i> VII.	=	<i>passim.</i>
• <i>fr.</i> 169.1-8, 16-7 (P.Oxy. 2450)	=	<i>Or.</i> II.226-9.
• <i>Ol.</i> II.86-8	=	<i>Or.</i> II.109.

Throughout this period the papyrus roll has been the dominant form of book; between the second and fourth centuries an alternative medium, the codex, came into use.³⁶

2. Ancient 'Υπομνήματα (commentaries)

Hellenistic discussions of difficult passages led not merely to the production of a reliable text of Pindar, but to commentaries in which the problems were discussed and interpretations offered. These explanatory works were normally written as separate texts independent of the work that they illustrated.³⁷ Remains of ancient commentaries survive, along with other matter, in the scholia found in the margins of medieval Mss of Pindar. Sometimes the later scholia cite the names of the authors who provided such explanations,³⁸ and thus we know of several Greek grammarians or philologists who were engaged in interpretative or editorial work.³⁹ Such activities had been going on without any serious disruption ever since the heyday of Alexandrian scholarship in the third and second centuries BC.

In the High Empire, however, literary interpretation and scholarly editing produced fewer remarkable achievements than descriptive grammar and linguistic theory.

One of the arguably most important contributions to the understanding of epic and lyric poetry in the early second century AD, was that of Aristides' teacher, **Alexander**

³⁶ **Roberts-Skeat** (1983: ch. 4,5 and 7); for bibliography see **Reynolds-Wilson** 1991: 251.

³⁷ References in the article of **Bömer** 1953: 215ff. We possess a large number of commentaries in papyri. For their form see Lobel's remarks in P. Oxy. 2307 p.95 and P. Oxy. 2429 p.35. As long as we have a corpus of a commentary, even if it is a collection of glossae or explanations, is called *ὑπόμνημα*; when it is marginal is 'scholia'. An *ὑπόμνημα* could also be written in a codex-form dating very late (e.g. the *ὑπόμνημα* of Euripides). The whole question is close related to the selection that took place some time in the II-III century AD: the commentaries are shortened after the time of Septimios Severos; the parts which are usually cut off are mainly quotations and paraphrases. However, the scheme of independent commentary is in use even in very late centuries, (the latest specimen in fully developed minuscule is dated in 829 AD).

³⁸ Names of Hellenistic scholars are also recorded in the *ὑπομνήματα* surviving on papyri; e.g. the writer of P. Oxy. 2451 (first or second-century commentary on *Isth.* I), introduces his discussion of the text with a brief *hypothesis* in which reference is made to Chamaeleon (B¹2), one of the earliest Pindaric scholars.

³⁹ For a bibliography on the scholiasts and grammarians of late antiquity, see **Reynolds-Wilson** 1991: 250-1 (vii).

from *Cotiaeum*.⁴⁰ From the author's many works we have a treatise on rhetorical figures. Alexander is also important for his interpretative work on poets. Nothing is preserved from his *ὑπομνήματα*,⁴¹ but we know from *Or.* XXXII that Alexander lectured⁴² and wrote *ὑπομνήματα* specifically on Homer (§26), Hesiod, Pindar, other Lyric poets and Plato:

24 καὶ μὴν εἰ Ὅμηρον Σμυρναίοις παρασχέσθαι | καὶ Παρίοις Ἀρχίλοχον
καὶ Βοιωτοῖς Ἡσίοδον καὶ Κείοις δὴ Σιμω|νίδην καὶ Στησίχορον Ἰμεραίοις καὶ 30
Θηβαίοις Πίνδαρον καὶ Μυτι|ληναίοις Σαπφῶ καὶ Ἀλκαῖον καὶ ἑτέροις
ἑτέρους τινὰς φέρει | φιλοτιμίαν — τὰς γὰρ Ἀθήνας ἐὼ τὰ νῦν —, ἥ που καὶ 1
ὕμᾱς μέγα | φρονεῖν εἰκὸς ἐπὶ τῷ τούτους ἅπαντας κοσμήσαντι καὶ δείξαντι.

(*Aristid.* 32 (12) 2,222-3,28ff. K).

The study of these authors was set in the curriculum of the school of Alexander.⁴³ Aristides was brought up by his teacher on these poets. Aristides may have used his teacher's *ὑπόμνημα* in places where he quotes ancient scholia on Pindar; however it is impossible to know for certain whether Aristides had indeed used this particular *ὑπόμνημα*. Alexander's *ὑπόμνημα* on Pindar when completed might have contained a compilation of exegetical scholia⁴⁴ and textual remarks,⁴⁵ which went back to the Hellenistic ones (Aristarchus).⁴⁶

Alexander evidently drew in his turn on Didymus' commentary, who had synthesised the already huge mass of critical work.

From my research it seems almost certain that Aristides employed ancient commentaries, and in a few cases he preferred to quote Pindar from an *ὑπόμνημα*, rather than from an edition.⁴⁷ The wording of the following quotations of Aristides is similar to the contents of the later Byzantine scholia (*schol. vetera*):

40. Son of Asclepiades. Alexander became so famous that he was appointed tutor to the Caesars Marcus and Verus, (Marcus Aurel. *Ad te ipsum* 1.10). Cf. **Alpers** 1998: 93-102; **Behr** 1968a: 10 n.22.

41. For his *ὑπομνήματα* in general: *Or.* XXXII.21.

42. Cf. §§25, 34: εἰ δὲ ἀληθεῖς οἱ Πινδάρου λόγοι καὶ Πλάτωνος.

43. He seems to have worked on Alcman (*Or.* XXVIII.54), and wrote a commentary on Aesop (*Or.* XXXII.27).

44. ὡς ἀρίστου κήρυκος τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ ἐξηγητοῦ (*Or.* XXXII.34).

45. Cf. Aristides' evidence on Alexander's textual work in general (*Or.* XXXII.21) ἐπεὶ κὰν τοῖς βιβλίοις ἃ διωρθοῦτο. The same term is employed for the corrective work of the Alexandrians (διώρθωσαν / διωρθώσαντο), cf. Tz. *Prol. Com.* (CGF I.19), **Pfeiffer** 1968: 105-22.

46. In *Or.* XVII.4 Aristides paraphrases Aristarchus' gloss τριτάτῳ.

47. A number of Imperial age authors employ such aid material for their quotes. Plutarch, for instance, acknowledges use of such material: *Il.* 9.458-61 are cited at *Mor.* 26 and Plutarch confidently alleges that Aristarchus athetised because of their impropriety; (whether or not these lines are genuine cf. **Janko** 1992: 28; **Hainsworth** 1993: 123). In *Mor.* 104A cites a glossa of Demetrius of Phalerum on Euripides. **Irigoin** (1952: 96) argues that Philostratus used an *ὑπόμνημα*.

• schol. <i>Ol.</i> I.40a	=	<i>Or.</i> XVII.3	cf. p. 152
• schol. <i>Ol.</i> I.40e	=	<i>Or.</i> XXI.10	cf. p. 156
• schol. <i>Pyth.</i> III.75	=	<i>Or.</i> XVII.4	cf. p. 163
• schol. <i>Ol.</i> VII.12a, e	=	<i>Or.</i> XXXIX.7, 16	cf. p. 98ff.
• schol. <i>Pyth.</i> III.149	=	<i>Or.</i> XXXIV.8-9	cf. p. 254
• schol. <i>Ol.</i> II.157a, b	=	<i>Or.</i> XXVIII.55	cf. p. 284
• schol. <i>Ol.</i> II.157a	=	<i>Or.</i> II.109	cf. p. 176ff.
• schol. <i>Pyth.</i> IX.164 ?	=	<i>Or.</i> XXIII.36	cf. p. 277

The content of Pindar scholia on *Olympians* cited by Aristides in *Ors.* II, XVII and XXVIII –probably from an ancient *ὑπόμνημα*–, overlaps or is similar to that of the Medieval scholia transmitted in the Byzantine Ms. A (*Ambros.* C 222 inf.).

The relationship is shown by places like:

- i. schol. *Ol.* II.157a, and b;
- ii. schol. *Ol.* I.40a where Aristides' ἐρανίζειν is a paraphrase of the corresponding scholion, and perhaps schol. *Ol.* VII.12e.

Almost all the scholia on *Epinicia* that Aristides cites are exegetic; exceptions are the schol. *Ol.* VII.12a (αὐτόχυτον at *Or.* XXXIX.16); and this on *Or.* XVII.4 (τρίτῳ βήματι), which might come from the same sort of source as the corresponding schol. *Pyth.* III.75 (βάματι τρίτάτῳ BDEFGQ).

Aristides appears to be less accurate in quoting extracts from a commentary on Pindar than he does in places where his source is either the original text or that of an anthology. Such are, to quote only a few: schol. *Ol.* VII.12a, e; schol. *Ol.* II.157a. An ancient citator treats an *ὑπόμνημα* with less respect than he does a classical text. Certain variations in phrasing between ancient commentaries and Medieval scholia can be also attributed to the casual treatment given in antiquity to commentaries and other informal texts.⁴⁸

Aristides attacked the incompetent grammatastae and annotators for their method of analysis of the Homeric text (*Or.* XXVIII.26). He also appears to be ironical about their scholarly interests (*ib.* 54). We may also suppose that Aristides may have also read the scholarly work of Apollonius of Alexandria, also known as Dyscolos (flor. 138 AD). Apollonius' work continued a long tradition of research on grammar and linguistic theory.⁴⁹ Grammatical works contain also quotations and references to Pindar and other poets.⁵⁰

48. Various quotations are left out in the subsequent copies of an *ὑπόμνημα* as less important material. A characteristic example is the papyrus *MPER* n.s. I 23, inv. 29817 that among the notes it contains on *Pyth.* I.46-68 it cites Eur. *Phoen.* 606, which is not provided in the Byzantine scholia.

49. *Dihle* 1994: 251ff. Apollonius' extant texts are monographs on pronouns, adverbs, and conjunctions, as well as the four books of a major treatise on syntax.

50. P. Ryl. 535 (I-IIAD) illustrates the phenomenon of 'συναλείφεισθαι' with a reference to Pindar and other poets. Apollon. *Dysc.* quotes Pindar more than ten times, and Herodian. 36 times.

3. Personal set of notes, annotations

The practice of compiling personal notes for individual use presumably began as soon as books became generally available, and notes may have been taken at lectures.⁵¹ It was natural for the lover of literature to copy passages from works which he had read and which attracted his attention, with a view to further perusal or citation.⁵²

This practice was very common among the scholars and writers of the Imperial Age. Plutarch for instance, tells us of his collection of notes he compiled and that he quickly browsed among them to find the appropriate quotations for his treatise *Περὶ Εὐθυμίας* 30 (464F) ἀνελεξάμην περὶ εὐθυμίας ἐκ τῶν ὑπομνημάτων ὧν ἑμαυτῷ πεποιημένος ἐτύγχανον, ἡγούμενος...⁵³

Aristides excerpted the works of Pindar as he did with other poetic works picking the best. His personal notes may have been full of the quotations that he made as he read, and could have been classified under general categories (e.g. 'praise for gods', 'praise for humans', 'praise for cities', myths), following a chronological order and being grouped together with others from the same author. Aristides may have used these "note books"⁵⁴ for a quicker reference rather than the texts from which he had originally copied.

Annotations in which text is explained by means of literary quotations are obviously of higher calibre than the more common glossing and paraphrasing notes. These notes were sometimes excerpted from a scholar's or a teacher's written *ὑπόμνημα*; even if the parallel cited comes from an author as well-known as Homer; (a characteristic example is the annotations in *PSI XI 1192* [II Oxy.] on *OT 196*, which explain a custom referred to in the play and illustrate the explanation with a quotation from the *Il.* 1.314. McNamee notes that the annotation is introduced by a lemma as if it had been copied directly out of an ancient commentary of standard lemma-plus-comment form).⁵⁵

4. Mythological compendia, διηγήσεις, περιοχαί

The great age of the commentator and the scholiast produced also many potted handbooks. Among them were the *Compendia*, which were abridgements of great works of literature. Many of these works though they may not be inspiring in themselves, had a significant secondary role. They offered an easy access to the literary texts, and were also

⁵¹. Out of a mass of evidence, I shall refer to two statements: 1. One may compare Socrates "unrolling the treasurers of the sages of old time, and to study and make extracts from them with his friends" in *X. Mem.* I 6.14: τοὺς θησαυροὺς τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν... ἀνελίττων κοινῇ σὺν τοῖς φίλοις διέρχομαι, καὶ ἂν τι ὀρώμεν ἀγαθὸν ἐκλεγόμεθα. 2. The other is the notes of Socrates' conversation with Theaetetus which Eucleides went home and wrote down from memory. (*Th.* 143a).

⁵². We possess several examples in papyri; cf. *Calderini Aegyptus*, 15: 239-45; *Pack* 1965: no. 2137.

⁵³. Cf. *Them. Or.* IV. p.54b ἀνθη ἀκήρατα συλλεξάμενος ἐκ τῶν Πλάτωνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους λειμῶνων.

⁵⁴. See now the authoritative discussion of. *Roberts-Skeat* 1983: 12ff. and ch. 4.

⁵⁵. *McNamee* 1977: 165.

valuable when their sources have been lost or mutilated.⁵⁶ We possess a great deal of papyrological evidence of epitomised literary works and especially from poetry.⁵⁷ This sort of handbook Aristides may have used sometimes instead of an original edition of Pindar especially when he quoted myths that the poet had treated. Mythological compendia were widely read in periods when Pindar was too long or too sophisticated or simply not generally available.

Of the mythographical literature, which we have to assume as abundant from the Hellenistic times onward, the *Bibliotheca* survives, which goes under the name of the great grammarian Apollodorus of Athens.⁵⁸

5. 'Ανθολογίαι

The era of the second sophistic cultivated particularly the genre of anthology, which was already so popular in the Hellenistic age.

The term 'anthology' has been widely applied to describe several collections of literary pieces which have come down to us in the Mss tradition and fragmentary remains in papyri. Their contents vary extremely: they may draw from the works of a single author or from many, and the inclusions may be either short pieces complete in themselves or selected passages from longer works; the length and the type of the literary extracts also vary: either in verse or prose or both.

Barns⁵⁹ makes a distinction concerning the purpose of these anthologies: some collections aim at the reader's pleasure, whereas in others the compiler's general aim is educational and the reader can derive permanent moral and intellectual benefit and he can use them as an aid to original composition.⁶⁰

In the Imperial age there were in circulation anthologies of Greek poetry⁶¹ and prose miscellanies, like the later one of Athenaeus or that of Stobaeus, who drew on

⁵⁶ Reynolds-Wilson 1991: 32

⁵⁷ E.g. P. Corn. 55 genealogy of mythic persons (I. AD), this fragmentary text was probably part of a school book from which only a few verses are preserved (= Rhadamanthys). There is a papyrus fragment containing the story of Menelaus and Iphigenia, see Lewis 1936: 87 no.7 (dated I-II. AD). The papyrus *MPER* ns, I (1932), p.130, no. XVII (III. AD), is written in two parts; the myth of Ixion is recounted in the first whereas the other contains the story of Artemis and the giants "Ἔτου and 'Εφιάλτου, or according to another view the story of Ποσειδών and 'Ιφιμέδεια. P. Oxy. 1.124 contains the story of Adrastus (II-III. AD). For other mythological collections cf.: P. Flor. inv. 155 (ed. Carlini no.2 [III AD]; the papyrus contains a collection of myths; the testimony concerns "Υλας who was abducted by the Nymphs); cf. also P. Köln. VII 285 (II AD); P. Oxy. 3702 (II/III AD); P. Vindob. gr. 26727: *Chron. d' Ég.* 1974: 317-24; *PSI* VIII.1000.

⁵⁸ The surviving book starts with the theogony and breaks off after dealing with various cycles of legends in the mythical genealogy of Attica. This opuscle sports the name of ancient authors, but draws on a late-Hellenistic manual.

⁵⁹ Barns 1950: 134ff.

⁶⁰ The 'Greek Anthology' belongs to the former class and such anthologies have a wholly different content and purpose from the kind with which we are principally concerned as Aristides' possible source for his Pindaric quotes.

⁶¹ They are named 'Ανθολόγιον, ἀνθολόγημα and later ἐκλογαί, συλλογαί, ἐπιτομαί. For examples see Pack 1965: nos. 1567-1622.

earlier ones.⁶² Philostratus (VS 565), mentions an anthology made by Herodes. Aristides may have used this anthology. These *anthologies* were compilations of poems culled from Greek epigrams, songs, and rhetorical exercises, and their subject matters were organised under specific topics (περὶ φιλίας, περὶ ἔρωτος, περὶ ἀνδρείας, etc.). This is exactly the kind of material Aristides found useful for his orations, and some of his knowledge on Pindar may have been derived from these *florilegia* and handbooks of selected passages.

It is probable that by the first / second century AD, parts of Pindar's Odes may have been excerpted and transmitted in anthologies. Aristides like Plutarch and Clemens drew on these collections. Plutarch's introductory notes in *consol. ad Apoll.* 120C, indicate that he probably cited them from an anthology recording their rubrics: *i.* Πινδάρου... περὶ τῶν εὐσεβῶν; *ii.* περὶ ψυχῆς λέγων (*i.e.* Pindar).

Aristides was intelligent and his command of Pindar's diction was adequate. If he offers an interpretation different from what Pindar intended we should look for an explanation: in this case, one of the possibilities that should be examined is that he may have drawn on an anthology. If he was aware of the original context of such quotations he would have been in a position to grasp the meaning that Pindar intended. The fact that he gives to them a different interpretation is suggestive that he took them from an anthology, (cf. *fr.* 108 [a]).

The difficulty that arises here is that Aristides may be familiar with the whole of a Pindaric poem, but he may deliberately decide to cite only a small part. The implication of that must be it is only rarely possible to demonstrate that Aristides cannot have known the original context.

6. Μίμησις – Παράφρασις

Even before the Atticist movement, the post-classical education in the Greek and Roman world was primarily based on the study of Homer, Euripides, Pindar and other classical authors. The imitation of the classical authors was of fundamental importance in the literary and scholarly production of the Hellenistic and Roman times.⁶³ The modern reader is liable to find it strange that such great educational value should have been attached to mere imitation.⁶⁴ This practice was mainly a concentration on a literary-linguistic canon, the so-called 'ἐγκριθέντες' or 'ἐκλογαί'.⁶⁵ The paraphrase was the

⁶². Cf. *Flor.* V, 59 "συναγωγή τῶν καλῶς ἀναφωνηθέντων ἐξ 'Ομήρου" of Hermippus.

⁶³. For the imitation in Greek and Roman literature see the detailed work of **Bompaire** 1958: 59-91; **Russell** 1979: 1-16; **Kroll** 1924: 139ff.

⁶⁴. For the position of μίμησις in education cf. **Reardon** 1971: 3-11; see **Gelzer** 1978: 34 ("Klassizismus, Attizismus und Asianismus").

⁶⁵. Cf. the 'πραττόμενοι' for Plato's dialogues.

preparatory stage of that imitation.⁶⁶ The students of grammar and rhetorical schools were prescribed various *παραφράσεις*, *ἀναδιηγήσεις*,⁶⁷ and *συνόψεις* from those authors who were considered difficult in terms of vocabulary and stylistic structure.⁶⁸ Pindar undoubtedly heads the list of the lyric poets.⁶⁹ The exercise of paraphrase was classified by Cicero in the «*cotidianae commentationes*» (*De orat.* I.154) of an aspiring orator. The paraphrases of poetic texts in particular, were important for the student of oratory in becoming accustomed to the style of a poet so as to be able later to insert freely excerpts into his future rhetorical compositions.

The *μίμησις* had various forms: the simplest form was the appropriation of words (*ἔρεισμα* : *fr.* 76) and expressions (*πάνυ μὲν οὖν* is a platonism), and the most complicated one was the precise impression of the author-model's style. Sometimes that *μίμησις* led to a real contest, which was called «*ζήλωσις*».⁷⁰

In one of his dream-revelations that Aristides received in Cathedra, Asclepius exhorted him to speak in the manner of Socrates, Demosthenes, and Thucydides or one of the distinguished personages, *i.e.* to study and use the previous literature as models for his own writings (cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).15). Aristides, like other writers of the Graeco-Roman period, had more than one classic author as model.⁷¹ However, that adherence to the classic models did not entail lack of creativity and original thought.

Aristides seems to have imitated Pindar's vocabulary in the following passages:

⁶⁶. For the importance of paraphrase in education see Ibrachim 1972: 26, 97ff. For the paraphrases as independent literary genre, cf. Stemplinger 1912: 212-5.

⁶⁷. One of the most striking samples of that paraphrasing technique is the famous school practice (*Μεταποίησις*) composed by Sopater *Πῶς δεῖ τόπον ποιητικὸν πρὸς πολιτικὸν μεταποιεῖν*, where a Homeric passage is transformed in 72 various ways of writing. See Glöckner 1910: 504-14.

⁶⁸. The Hellenistic schools gave much importance to the exercise of paraphrase and interpretation of the classical texts. The paraphrased text should be very close to the original. We possess a great deal of papyrological evidences. Briefly I mention a papyrus fragment containing a paraphrase of *Il.* K.41-57 (*MPER* n.s. III [1939]: 11, no.1: I-II AD); and another papyrus containing a paraphrase in 34 iambic trimeters of a scene from Eur. *Phoen.*: *PSI XIII/I* (1949), no.1303 (III AD). The precision in rendering the style of the original suggests a teacher's work.

A large number of papyrus fragments from the 2nd cent. AD shows that these exercises were very common in the school curriculum. P. Akhmim, 2 = *BIFAO*, XXXI (1931), ed. P. Collart, p.43 (III AD), and P. Bon. I, (1935) no.6 (III AD), preserve each a paraphrase of the beginnings of *Iliad*, whereas P. Oxy. 2544 preserves a *ὑπόθεσις* of Eur. *Phoen.* It is therefore probable that the same practice happened to Pindar for educational and rhetorical purposes.

⁶⁹. The evidence of existing manuscripts and scholia suggests that the epinician odes were read. However, the *epinician* papyri are of the Christian era, while of the other papyrus fragments, all earlier than the third century, most are from the *paeans*. Poethke (1981: 93-6), provides a brief survey of the papyrological tradition, dates and provenance not only of papyrus-texts of Pindar, but also of authors who cite Pindar.

⁷⁰. For the term and its meaning see Reiff 1956. Quintilianus considers even the paraphrasis as a kind of *ζήλωσις* (10.5.5): *neque ego paraphrasin esse interpretationem tantum volo, sed circa eosdem sensus certamen atque aemulationem*.

⁷¹. *E.g.* Dion. Halicar. in his *Antiquitates Romanae* imitates Thucydides, Herodotus, Demosthenes, and Xenophon. Cf. the works of Ek 1942, Flierle 1890.

<i>Ol.</i> IX.26+ <i>Eur.Hipp.</i> 76 (<i>Or.</i> XXX.16)	<i>fr.</i> 33c.5 (<i>Or.</i> XLIII.13)	<i>fr.</i> 76 (<i>Ors.</i> I.9, 124)
<i>Ol.</i> VI.99; VII.4 (οἶκοθεν οἶκαδ')	<i>fr.</i> 75.9 (<i>Hieros Logos</i> 4 (50).39)	<i>Ol.</i> I.38 (ἐρανον: ἐρανίζω)
<i>Or.</i> XLV.25	<i>fr.</i> 75.14 (<i>Ors.</i> XX, XLVI)	<i>Ol.</i> I.75 (<i>Or.</i> XXXIV.25)

7. Lexica – Γλωσσάρια

In the study and interpretation of Pindar Aristides may have resorted to the use of (rhetoric) *lexica*, “συναγωγαὶ λέξεων”, and “ὠκυτόκια”,⁷² which were in abundance in the Graeco-Roman world.⁷³ These books all gave guidance to the would-be writer of classical Attic prose; in general they listed words or constructions current in everyday use, and then added the correct classical idiom containing occasionally quotations. The lexicographic collections of authorised linguistic material were the most extreme exposition of Atticism.

Dictionaries of Attic diction by Aelius Dionysius and Pausanias under Hadrian (AD 117-38) have survived in fragments;⁷⁴ we have also complete works by Pollux⁷⁵ and Phrynichus⁷⁶ dating from the reigns of Marcus Aurelius (AD 161-80) and Commodus (AD 180-92). Moeris' “Λέξεις Ἀττικάι”⁷⁷ was the strictest of the Atticist lexicography that was produced in the second century AD. Atticism was not unopposed; an anonymous lexicon of the second half of this century “Ἀντιαττικιστής”, expands the number of admissible authors.

The object of the lexicographic works was to present youths with a kind of store-house, from which they could borrow all the words of which they had need, and could at the same time learn their usage in the best writers.⁷⁸ The *lemmata* were often illustrated with a great number of quotations from ancient authors (as in the extant *Ὀνομαστικόν*; various glossaries and word-lists in papyri also included a varied number of poetry and prose quotations, cf. P. Oxy. 2087 [II AD]; P. Oxy. 1801 [I AD]; P. Oxy. 1802 [II/III AD]). Pindar is quoted in the majority of the extant second century lexicographic sources:

72. Title of a collection of synonyms, Suid. s.v. Τήλεφος Περγαμηνός.

73. A great number of glossaries were compiled to meet the school needs. **Calderini** (1921), published nine Roman school glossaries calling them ‘*commenti minori*’ to discern from the *ὑπομνήματα*.

74. For both see the collection of fragments by **Erbse** 1949 [1950]; their source had been Diogenianus of Heraclea (“Λέξεις παντοδαπαὶ κατὰ στοιχεῖον”, **Erbse** 1949 [1950]: 36), who can be traced back via Julius Vestinus to the Aristarchean Pamphilus of Alexandria (I AD: he recorded the lexicographic tradition in a lexicon of “γλῶσσαι” in 95 books).

75. “Ὀνομαστικόν” (10 books). Each book forms a separate treatise by itself, containing important words relating to certain subjects, with short explanations and frequently illustrated by quotations.

76. We have excerpts of his “Σοφιστικὴ προπαρασκευή” (37 books), and “Ἀττικιστής” (2 books). They were based on Eirenaeus and Aelius Dionysius.

77. The title varies in different Mss. It consists of a list of Attic words and expressions which are illustrated or explained by those of other dialects, especially the Κοινή Greek.

78. It should be noticed that the ancient Lexica in not a reliable source for the transmitted text; cf. **Naoumides**' remark (1961: 388): “the dictionaries were not copied with the same accuracy as the texts of the classical authors”.

- **Phryn. praep. soph.** 22, 8 = *Pyth.* II.76;
132, 18 = *fr.* 124a;
- **Pollux** 3, 17 = *Ol.* VI.84;
- **Harpocr.** s.v. 'Αβαρις' (*fr.* 270), 'αὐτόχθονες' (*fr.* 253),
'βάσανος' (*Pyth.* X.67), 'παλιναίρετος' (*fr.* 84).

Pindaric extracts are also quoted in Byzantine etymologica: *Et. M.* (38 times); *Et. Gen.* (8 times); *Et. Gud.* (6 times); *Et. Parv.* (1 time).

The use of a lexical source must be considered for *Or.* XLV.3, where Aristides quotes a sequence of snatches: *frs.* 350, 351, 352, 353, *Isth.* III.70 and *Ol.* III.11ff., VI.43, 50 saying nothing about their authority and the original context;⁷⁹ *id.* 13: *frs.* 354, 355, 52h.13-4, *Isth.* VIII.61, and perhaps *Pyth.* VI.11ff.: νεφέλας στρατός in Aristides' οὔτε νεφέλας ἄστρατον..., if Keil's supplement is to be accepted. It seems probable for Aristides to have taken these passages from glossaries as those on Homer, tragic poets, and Menander and the reason might be the short length of them as well as that they are less common words.

8. Paroemiographical collections –χρεῖται, γνῶμαι

Many quotations from literature and especially from poetry enjoyed an independent life as proverbs or gnomai. Gradually the gnome became a literary genre and this led to the compilation of *gnomologia*.⁸⁰ In the Hellenistic era we meet with collections of proverbs by Seleucus, Didymus⁸¹ and Lucillus of Tarrha. These were augmented in the course of time.

The second sophistic created a demand for proverbs and gnomai as an ornament for style (especially in Atticists).⁸² Bompaire argues⁸³ that we can be sure that Aristides (*Ors.* III, IV, XXXIV),⁸⁴ Lucianus, Aelianus and Plutarch, used such collections. Aristides in particular, exploited them as part of his polemic against philosophers.

The study of γνῶμαι was part of the educational system in antiquity.⁸⁵ Evidence from the papyri suggests that the authors widely read were Hesiod, Pindar, Euripides, Menander, Callimachus, Plato, Isocrates, and Thucydides. Many proverbs of literary

⁷⁹ Cf. Höfler 1935: 25.

⁸⁰ The ἀπόφθεγμα and ὑποθήκη have similar meaning to *gnome*, whose feature was the brevity and therefore easy to memorise. For the slight distinction between *maxim*, *proverb* and *gnome*, cf. *RE* s.v. 'gnome'. These were mixed occasionally with anthologies (Bompaire 1958: 394 n.1).

⁸¹ "Πρὸς τοὺς περὶ παροιμιῶν συντεταχότας" (13 books). Didymus augmented Aristophanes' collection; see Pfeiffer 1968: 279, n.2.

⁸² For their value cf. S.E. *adv. gramm.* I 271=660B εἴ ποτε παραινεντικῶς τι λέγοιεν, ταῖς ποιητικαῖς φωναῖς ὥσπερ σφραγίζεσθαι τὸ ὑπ' αὐτῶν λεγόμενον; cf. Ps. Aristid. (Spengel II, 499) γλυκύτης γίνεται... ἐξ (ιστοριῶν) καὶ παροιμιῶν (καὶ μύθων).

⁸³ 1958: 420 with n.2; 444.

⁸⁴ Boulanger (1923: 438), assumes that Aristides employed such material for *Ors.* XXVIII, XXXIII, XXXIV.

⁸⁵ Cf. Barns 1950: 126ff.; cf. P. Berol. 12310; Ostr. Berol. 12319 (III BC poetic γνῶμαι); PSI 1093; MPER n.s. III no.25, col.1.

origin (e.g. πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν [cf. *Pyth.* II.94-5]) became popular and were used in colloquial Greek. Aphthonius lists *Χρεῖαι* or ('anecdotes')⁸⁶ among the *progymnasmata*, and students were given a saying or a description of an action by a famous person and expected to work it out by expanding and paraphrasing its meaning, and citing literary examples.⁸⁷

Three main versions of the Hellenistic collections circulated in that period:

a. Zenobius, (II AD, sophist): an abbreviated alphabetic form of the collections of Didymus and Lucillus Tarrhaeus.

b. "*Proverbs of Plutarch used by the Alexandrians*",⁸⁸ and

c. A collection of 775 proverbs in alphabetical order attributed to Diogenianus of Heraclea, (II AD, grammarian): "*Παροιμῖαι δημῶδεις ἐκ τῆς Διογενιανοῦ συναγωγῆς*".

We have to mention also Favorinus' "*γνωμολογικά*", used by Stobaeus.⁸⁹

A number of poetic quotations are dispersed in paroemiographical collections, and a considerable number was culled from lyric poets. Pindar's gnomic statements have an ethical import which is a constant and essential feature of the gnomic anthologies. Pindaric quotations figure in the following second-century collections:

- **Diogenian.** 3, 94 = *fr.* 110, *Apostol.* V. 51: Γλυκὺς ἀπείρω πόλεμος
7, 12 = *fr.* 203
- **Zenob.** 2, 18 = *fr.* 106
5, 20 = *Nem.* IV.59.
5, 59 = *fr.* 203
6, 43 = *Isth.* II.11

9. Quotations from Memory⁹⁰

Certain Pindaric songs could have achieved universal popularity among the later authors (e.g. the *Dithyramb for Athens*), and so have been reproduced from memory. Some of Aristides' quotations from Pindar were probably committed to memory at an early time during his studies under the grammaticus.

It was part of the rhetorical education for students to memorise extracts from poetry and prose in order to be able to substantiate their opinions with quotations and reminiscences.⁹¹ This was feasible with repeated reading of texts prescribed in the school curriculum.⁹²

⁸⁶. For the various kinds of *χρεῖαι* (: λογική, πρακτική, μικτή), see Brinkmann 1910: 152ff.

⁸⁷. We possess a great number of papyri on *χρεῖαι*, e.g. *MPER* ns, III (1939), p.52, no. XXXII (II. AD); P. Reinach II (1940), no. 85 (III. AD); O. Wilcken, II (1899), nos. 1226, 1310 (Roman age).

⁸⁸. Drawn from Seleukos of Alexandria.

⁸⁹. Cf. Freudenthal 1880: 424.

⁹⁰. On the significance of memorisation, cf. Householder 1941: 64.

⁹¹. Cf. Pseudo-Longin. *Περὶ ὕψους* 13. 3 ...ἔστι δ' οὐ κλοπή τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν † ἡθῶν ἢ † πλάσματων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀποτύπωσις.

⁹². Repeated reading penetrates into *memoria* (Quint. *IO* 10.1.19). For the antiquity of the practice of memorisation in education cf. *Lg.* 810e: here it appears that extracts were frequently made for committing

It is not difficult to imagine that Aristides, like every ancient reader, faced with the need to verify a quotation or check a reference, would rely sometimes on his memory of the passage rather than go to the trouble of unwinding the papyrus roll; this format presented a number of obvious disadvantages to the users.⁹³

This would certainly be one of the reasons that account for differences between the two versions.⁹⁴

10. 'Double borrowing' of quotations

It is no doubt possible that a number of late authors found a portion of the most well-worn quotations in the indirect tradition on which they drew. This process is better known as 'Double borrowing'.⁹⁵ Through this process a quotation from an established poet can become eventually a poetic 'cliché' (tag).

An illustrative instance concerns Hes. *Op.* 293, 295-7, which Aristides cites among a series of quotations from Homer and Pindar in *Or.* II.97. Aristides' source must be the text of other authors, who also omitted l.294 like Aristot. *EN* 1095b 10 (et 294 in *cod. rec.*); Zeno (*fr.* 235); Clem. *Paed.* 3, 8; Stob._{MA} 3.4.25, *Gnomol. Par.* 1630 (*An. Boiss.* i.115). All these might also have used a common source: it is understandable that l.294 should have been passed over by someone who quoted the passage, since –according to West (*ad loc.*)– “it limited the applicability of the [former] gnome”.

It is also noteworthy that Aristides gives no more information about Stesichorus' *Palinode* than could be gathered from *Phdr.* 243aff.

11. Manuals on Rhetoric

The industrious cultivation of sophistic show–speeches, together with training in rhetoric, which was compulsory for a higher career, are unthinkable without an abundant theoretical literature.

The most common form of the rhetorical–didactic treatise in the first and second centuries AD, was the *ars rhetorica*, or τέχνη ῥητορική. As the reading of poetry in rhetorical instruction was mainly intended to help the development of stylistic skills, examples for this sort of manual as well as for treatises on rhetorical figures were taken

to memory (ἐκμαθάνειν); cf. also Protagoras' description of the whole of Athenian education (326e): ἀναγιγνώσκειν ποιητῶν ἀγαθῶν ποιήματα καὶ ἐκμαθάνειν ἀναγκάζουσιν.

⁹³. For a good account of the difficulties see Gallo 1986: 12ff.

⁹⁴. Behr without adducing proofs (1968a: 11 with n.28), argues that errors in quoting were due to faulty memory. However we should be careful in imputing such errors entirely to memory failure. It is hard to imagine Cyril of Alexandria committing to memory in *Adv. Jul.* 2.37, a passage 96 words in length from a work such as Porphyrius' *De abstinentia*.

⁹⁵. Anderson (1976: 61), has addressed this question in relation to Lucian's quotations arguing that a part of his knowledge of classical poetry derives from 'Double borrowing'. Several of his instances were quarried from *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*.

freely from poetry, in particular that of Homer, Pindar, and Euripides (cf. the treatises of Theon *Prog.*, and D.H. *Rh.*).

Classical scholars owe a great debt to these abridgements and commentaries, grammars and handbooks, for they have preserved, even if at second-hand or in fragmentary form, a very considerable amount of literature and learning that would otherwise have perished.⁹⁶ They also enable us to correct passages in extant authors where the text has been corrupted in the direct manuscript tradition.

The next part of the thesis concerns the discussion and interpretation of Pindaric quotations.

⁹⁶. These manuals also enable the late Roman and medieval readers to gain access to classical literature and to give their writings a veneer of learning. (Reynolds-Wilson 1991: 33).

PART B

PINDARIC QUOTATIONS

II. *QUOTATIONS in PRAISE:*

II. 1 of Gods

II. 2 of Individual(s)

II. 3 of Ancient cities

Aristides and the Prose-Hymns

Ten of Aristides' extant orations belong to an oratorical genre of his own making: the prose-hymns. These are prose hymnal praises addressed mainly to gods, but also, though less frequently, to places and monuments. The prose-hymns display in general a religious zest expressed with all the power of rhetorical diction and the vigour of sophistic oratorical argumentation. The statement of purpose of the genre in the beginning of Aristides' hymn *Εἰς Σάραπιν* (XLV) suggests that Aristides understands the genre as being the orator's answer to poetry and poetical hymns. The rhetor defends his 'Kunstprosa' against the traditional metrical poetic form propounding the merits of prose-hymns as a rival form¹ that can do at least as well, and in general better, in adequately extolling its (divine) subject.²

There Aristides lays down the foundations of the rhythmical characteristics of the prose-hymn; against the narrow sense of the poetic μέτρον he compares, and favours, the orator's prior and more pervasive μέτρον that holds together the rhythm and symmetry of the whole hymnal discourse in prose. He opposes the traditional identification of μέτρον solely with the poetic verse and he attacks the received view that poetic diction is more difficult and "arty" than oratorical speech. Although the orator is at a disadvantage compared to the poet because he has to be more complete and convincing in extolling his subject,³ the prose-hymn is, precisely because of its thoroughness and apposite content, more adequate and apt a form to praise a god.

¹. It is of course wrong to say that some of the exponents of prose in the sophistic period "*wished to displace poetry and to arrogate every field for prose*". Cf. **Bowie's** discussion, 1989: 210ff. On the competitive stance rhetoric would adopt towards poetry in the era of the Second Sophistic see **Webb** 1997: 345ff.

². Beside their importance as the orator's statement on rhetoric, it should not be overseen that they offer an equally important testimony of Aristides' piety, understood not only in terms of the external events of his relation to god (Asclepius) but also as an internal itinerary of a deeply religious soul. The testimony *Hieroi Logoi* offer in this respect is all the more important because Aristides' prose-hymns represent a unique example of piety in the second century of the Imperial Age. They are in this sense unique, because they reveal the piety not of a philosopher, nor that of a priest, but that of an intellectual, whose multilayered erudition calls him to address and accommodate confrontations among diverse and often rival cultural traditions of disciplines, as the one between philosophy and rhetoric and, here, rhetorical hymns and lyric poetry; see **Moreschini** 1994: 1234-5. For the significance of *Hieroi Logoi* as a testimony of Aristides' religious feelings and in general for his presence as a second century intellectual, see **Moreschini** 1994.

³. Commenting in particular on the lyric poets' *hymns* and *paeans* (§3), Aristides makes the point, among others, that poets enjoy the privilege of using just a couple of strophes or periods to complete

As the principal source of Aristides' citations of lyric poetry, particularly when it comes to lyric hymns Pindar may be thought of as the poet the orator has mainly in mind when he compares (lyric) poetic hymns (to the gods) with his proposed genre of prose hymns. He quotes mainly from Pindar when in the genre's programmatic statement in the hymn *Εἰς Σάραπιν* he makes a frontal attack to the poets' claimed monopoly of composing hymns to gods (§3) and one feels licensed to understand the orator as competing with his favourite poet when composing both lyric hymns in verse to the gods, but also, and mainly, when he writes his prose-hymns to a number of gods. In so doing, the orator seeks to show his genre as an artistic form capable of rising to the exalted status poetry claims exclusively for herself as the proper discourse for hymnal praises to the gods. Aristides could after all claim that he had tried his hand in both the poetic and the prose form of hymnal praise.⁴

The development of the prose-hymn is generally accepted to have taken place during Aristides' stay in Pergamum and his repeated incubations at the Asclepieium to convalesce from his long disease. Aristides seems to have found in the prose-hymns a suitable form of expression to release his pious feelings to gods. His praises verge on the hyperbole, making extreme attributions of power and majesty to the gods extolled.⁵ In so doing he draws heavily from his favoured works of archaic and classical poetry (from which he derives the mythical elements), and primarily among them Pindar, while his extensive travels have availed him with the knowledge of the panthea and the religious practices of other people in the East, which enables him to make syncretistic identifications and assimilations to enforce the status of the gods he praises.

Poetic quotations loom up in all Aristides' prose-hymns. There are no less than 99 quotations in total; in particular: **epic poetry** (65), **lyric poetry** (23), **tragedy** (7), and **comedy** (4). The following table aims to show in greater detail the distribution of Aristides' poetic quotations in his prose-hymns:

their whole task at hand, as opposed to the daunting demand placed on the orators' shoulder for exhaustiveness.

⁴. Aristides composed two hymns, one in prose and one in verse for Athena, Dionysus, Heracles, and Asclepius.

⁵. Aristides' themes in his hymns to gods appear already in the instructions given by Quintilian (3.7.7-8), and Alexander Numeniu (iii.4-6 Spengel); cf. **Boulanger** 1923: 310-11, and **Russell** 1990a: 208.

I. AD 141-5		II. <i>Cathedra</i>		AD 145-7		III. AD 143-53		IV. AD 154-64		V. AD 165-89									
Or. XLV 25-4-142		Or. XLI early of 145-7		Or. XXXVIII Aug. 147		Or. XLIII Feb. 149		Or. XXXVII Jan. 153		Or. XLIV April. 155		Or. XLVI Sum. 156		Or. XL Aug. 166		Or. XXXIX Jan. 167		Or. XLII 6-1-177	
Arat. Ph. 2 \$30						<i>h Hom.</i> 3.132 \$25 Arat. Ph. 2 \$26 Arat. Ph. 33 \$8				Cypria fr. 4 \$16		<i>Nostoi</i> (cf nos Od. 3.103ff. 117) \$18 <i>h Hom.</i> 6.10ff. \$15						Hes. Op. 26 \$2	
1. 419 \$3 2. 489 \$16 6. 138 \$3 9. 497 \$26 15. 187ff. \$23 15. 193 \$24				2. 56 \$1		4. 299 \$17 8. 1ff. \$22 8. 19 \$15 9. 97 \$31		8. 387ff. \$5 19. 93 \$7 21. 401 \$6		1. 316 \$16 11. 298 \$1 16. 391 \$1 16. 640 \$17 23. 316 \$1		2. 570 \$22 7. 99 \$6 8. 48 \$19 8. 203 \$19 13. 6 \$19 13. 21 <i>confuted for 8. 203</i> 13. 27-31 <i>(Od. 1.27)</i> \$19 14. 201 \$12 14. 216-7 \$25 15. 37-8 \$6 15. 166 \$14				2. 469ff. \$13 2. 754 \$7 18. 470ff. \$11			
O d				4. 564 \$20		4. 581 \$28		5. 382ff. \$23 5. 437 \$16 8. 193ff. \$21 13. 429ff. \$23 22. (stories) \$23		3. 270 \$9 12. 351 \$9 19. 113ff. \$16		1. 22 \$19 3. 177 \$18 4. 74 \$20 5. 334 \$34 5. 351 \$38 12. 55ff. \$17 13. 332 \$39				9. 94 \$2			
y s s e y																			
P i n d o l OI. III. 11ff. OI. VI. 43, 50 Isch. III. 70 fr. 354 \$13 fr. 355 fr. 52h. 13-4 Isch. VIII. 61 Pyth. VI. 11		fr. 99 \$6 fr. 283(?) \$6 Alcm. fr. 6P \$7		fr. 33d. 1-2 \$12 fr. 35a \$30		fr. 33c. 5? \$13 fr. 35a \$30		fr. 146 \$6		fr. 33c. 5? \$14		fr. 75. 14 \$25				OI. VII. 7 \$16		fr. 95 \$12	
T r a g		Eur. fr. 663N \$11						A. fr. 388N \$29		Eur. Tr. 1 \$1 Tr. 2-3 \$9 <i>Id.</i> fr. 882 (error for II. 16.391) \$1				S. Ph. 174 \$14				Undertied fr. 39N \$4	
C o m		Ar. V. 1019f. \$11								Ar. Nu. 284 \$1 Pl. 650 \$17								Ar. Av. 1334 \$5	

The overwhelming majority of the poetic quotations comes from the peak of Aristides' career. In particular, we can notice the following:

1. Pindar - Lyric poets: Pindaric quotations figure in all the prose-hymns, with the only exemption the *Or.* XL (*Ἡρακλῆς*). Surprisingly enough quotations from other Lyric poets seem to be out of Aristides' agenda except for a quotation from Alcman (*fr.*56, *Or.* XLI).

2. Homer: Although we have fewer Homeric quotations in the prose-hymns dating to the Cathedra and the last period of Aristides' life (AD 165-89), there is an increasing number in those prose-hymns dating to the two intermediary periods (: AD 143-53 and 154-64), especially in the latter when Aristides resumes his career on a full scale. This is also true for the quotations from other epic poets.

3. Tragedy: The three major tragedians are represented with at least one quotation each: Euripides (4?), Aeschylus (1), Sophocles (1), unidentified (1).

4. Comedy: We have four quotations from Aristophanes in *Ors.* XLI, XLII, XLIV, which usually come immediately after those from Tragic poets, especially Euripides.

Aristides' Lyric songs

An examination of the existing evidence suggests that sophists composed poetry in various genres: epic (Scopelianus), lyric poetry, tragedy, and epigram (which dominated the reconstructed *corpus* of sophistic poetry).

Surprisingly the surviving choral verses in honour of various divinities are by Aristides. They were composed in the time of Cathedra after divine command.⁶ Someone could have expected that in worshipping long-established divinities traditional songs were sung⁷ alongside the new compositions.

Aristides had a genuine interest in Pindar's hymnal compositions and saw him as a model in composing songs (*paeans*), snatches of which he quotes in *Hieros Logos* 4 (50). Aristides' «λέξις» and «φράσις» recall the Pindaric «ῥψος». The «ζήλωσις» of

⁶. Cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50); Heitsch 1964: 41-2 (*frs.*1-5). For a fuller discussion see Bowie 1989: 214ff.

⁷. Cf. Bowie 1990: 83-4 with n.67.

Pindar's style is aimed at the use of striking poetic expressions recalling Pindar's onomatopoeia:

1. In *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).31 on the occasion of the *Ludi Apollinares Circenses* on July 13, Aristides composes:

‘Φορμίγγων ἄνακτα Παιᾶνα κληίσω.⁸

The quoted verse, which is intended as his own, seems to be a free adaptation of Pindar's:

Ol. II.1-2 Ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὕμνοι, ... κελαδήσομεν;
Nem. V.24-5 φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων ἐπτάγλωσσον | ...
 ἀγείτο παντοίων νόμων

2. In *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).42, one of his fellow pilgrims in Pergamum dreams of an Aristides' paeon with the invocation:

‘Ἠ Παιάν Ἡρακλῆς Ἀσκληπιέ’ = Pind. *Pae.* II.35 Ἠ ἰὲ Παιάν.

It is possible that Aristides had in mind Pindar's paeon refrains in his verse compositions. The paeon refrain known from Pindar and a number of Hellenistic cult hymns is ἰὲ Παιάν, or Ἠ Παιάν, or Ἠ ἰὲ Παιάν. The paeon cry occurs in regular intervals in Pindar's paeans: it comes at the beginning or end of a poem or a major metrical section such as a triad.⁹ The following variant forms occur in Pindar's paeans:

- a. Ἠ Ἠ (Pae. I.5),
- b. Ἠ ἰὲ Παιάν (Pae. II.35),
- c. Ἠ Ἠ, ὦ ἰὲ Πα[ιάν] (Pae. IV.31),
- d. Ἠῖε (Pae. V.1), and
- e. <Ἠ> Ἠτε (Pae. VI.121).

These verses alongside his Pindaric quotations in prose-hymns are an important indication that Pindar still enjoyed great prestige and was considered as an outstanding

⁸. Aristides is familiar with the triadic division of the poem (: strophe-antistrophe-epode) cf. *id.* I. 28.

⁹. In *Pae.* II and IV the refrain occurs at the end of each triad, at the beginning of each strophe of *Pae.* V, and at the end of one of the three triads of VI; however we do not have refrain in the remnants of *Pae.* III, VIIb, VIII, and IX.

model of lyric poet from classical age. Aristides feels here an urge to imitate Pindar's diction rather than to excel as a sophistic poet.

II. 1 QUOTATIONS IN PRAISE OF GODS

II.1.1 The Pindaric Hymn to Zeus <ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ> (frs. *31, 32,*33, 33c, *33d, *35a)

In the Alexandrian edition of Pindar, the book of *Hymns* began with the *hymn to Zeus*¹ The opening lines² (fr.29) are preserved in Lucian's quotation in *Dem. Enc.* 19 (cf. schol. *ad loc.* ἀρχαὶ ταῦτα τοῦ Πινδάρου τοῦ μελοποιοῦ ὕμνων).³

A description of a divine banquet was prominent in it. Fr.29 reveals that the hymn was composed for a Theban festival of Zeus;⁴ in a humorous narrative, Lucian describes an Olympian banquet at which the Muses sing a passage from Hesiod's *Theogony*, and “the first hymn of Pindar”. The passage in Lucian, *Icarom.* 27, also suggests that Pindar's hymn dealt with the theme of creation.

Aristides holds an important place among the later writers of antiquity contributing much to our knowledge of the whole work. His quotations are a valuable addition to our remnants of the hymn. In four different orations he preserves six fragments from the lost Pindaric hymn, which the Teubner editors of Pindar printed among others preserved from the first hymn in the following order: frs. 32; *33; 33c; *33d; *31 and *35a.

Aristides' statements after his quotations of Pind. frs.*31 and *35a, along with fr.*30 –preserved by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5, 14,137,1– show that Zeus was prominent in the hymn. The form of the title of the poem partly preserved in fr.*31 may indicate the treatment of Zeus' wedding by Pindar in this part of the hymn.

The wedding of Cadmos and Harmonia was honoured by the presence of the Gods. From Aristides' quotation of fr. 32, Bruno Snell argued that “*Apollo, along with the Muses, regaled the wedding guests of Cadmos with a great mythological account which*

¹. For the whole *hymn* see Wilamowitz 1920: 468; *id.* 1922: 189ff. It dates from early in Pindar's career if we believe a literary anecdote recorded by Plutarch in *glor. Ath.* 4 p.347F-348A, that these lines were the answer to Corinna's criticism of the young Pindar for not using myths in his poetry which were very fitting for poetic compositions. See Bowra 1964: 279-81; Race 1986: 3.

². For the progress and the development of a *hymn's* proem, cf. Schadewaldt 1928: 18 [276]; Meyer 1933: 54ff.; Thummer 1968-69: 83ff.

³. That it was the beginning of the *hymn* is attested also by the scholia on *Nem.* X.1a ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος ... ἐν τῇ ᾠδῇ, ἥς ἡ ἀρχή· Ἰσμηνὸν — Μελίαν.

⁴. Snell 1953: 73.

told of the origin of gods and men.”⁵ The various marriages of Zeus (*frs.* *30; *31) and the theogonic references (*frs.* *30; 33c; *33d; **34) formed a central part in Apollo's account.

II.I.I Aristid. 2, 420 (1,277 L.-B.) = Pind. *Fr.* *31.

The quotation at issue comes from the second part of this oration and in particular from the section §§362-437 where Aristides discusses the power of the true orator.⁶

Aristides in §411 reserves for oratory the major role in the society that makes it appropriate for all occasions and indispensable even to the most peaceful society. What Aristides says in this section about oratory can be related to the *epideictic* genre, although in the greatest part of *Or. II* there is nothing else that can be taken even as an indirect reference to this genre.⁷ He explicitly believes that oratory is the discipline appropriate for praising and adorning (πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἐπέρχεται καὶ κοσμεῖ καὶ πᾶσιν αὐτῇ πρέπουσα ὁμοίως φαίνεται).

Aristides' context

At §417 the art of oratory is presented as something wonderful providing a great advantage to whatever art joins it. If medicine (§412) strategy (§413) and navigation (§416) would combine with the art of oratory, they could be more effective in their function.

II. (XLV D.) ΠΡΟΣ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΡΗΤΟΡΙΚΗΣ.

417 Οὐκοῦν ἰδίᾳ τε [πανταχοῦ] θαυμαστὴ καὶ οἷς ἂν προσγένηται ῥοπὴν 15
| τοσαύτην παρέχεται. φημὶ δ' ἔγωγε καὶ κάλλος τε καὶ ῥητορικὴν
συνελθόντα τῇ ῥητορικῇ κριθήσεσθαι, καὶ οὐδένα τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡδέως
ὄψεσθαι | μᾶλλον ἢ ἡδέως ἀκούσεσθαι λέγοντος. ἔοικεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο Ὅμηρος |
μαρτυρεῖν

Οὐ τότε γ' ὦδ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀγασσάμεθ' εἶδος ἰδόντες. 20

ὥς, ἔφη, τὴν πυκνότητα τῶν νοημάτων καὶ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς φωνῆς | 1
418 τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν, διοσημίᾳ παρεικάζων τὴν ῥητορείαν αὐτοῦ. μαρ|τυρεῖ
δὲ καὶ ἐν οἷς ἀρτίως ἐλέγομεν

Ἄλλος μὲν γάρ τ' εἶδος ἀκιδνότερος πέλει ἀνὴρ,
ἀλλὰ θεὸς μορφήν ἔπεισι στέφει

5

οὐκ ἀργῶς οὐδ' ἀπλῶς εἰπὼν τὸ στέφει, ἀλλ' ἐνδεικνύμενος ὅτι οὐ | μόνον
τὰ ἐλαττώματα ἀναπληροῖ, ἀλλὰ προσέτι νικᾶν ποιεῖ, ἐπειδὴ γε | καὶ ὁ

⁵ *Ibid* 74.

⁶ For an introduction to *Or. II* cf. p.167ff.

⁷ Karadimas (1996: 142), is right in recognising in §411 a reference to this genre of oratory.

- 419 στέφανος νίκης ἐστὶ σύμβολον. τὸν οὖν αἰσχρὸν καλῶς δυνάμενον | λέγειν
 ὅτε τοῦ καλλίστου, λέγειν δὲ ἀδυνάτου, πρότερον τίθῃσι, τὸν | ἅμα καλὸν καὶ 10
 ῥήτορα εἰκότως καὶ ἀκολούθως φησὶ μᾶλλον θαυμασθῆναι | παρὰ τοὺς
 λόγους.
- 420 Πίνδαρος δὲ τοσαύτην ὑπερβολὴν ἐποίησατο ὥστε ἐν Διὸς
 γάμῳ | καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοὺς φησιν ἐρομένου τοῦ Διὸς εἴ του δέοιντο
 αἰτῆσαι | ποιήσασθαί τινας αὐτῷ θεοὺς, οἵτινες τὰ μεγάλα ταῦτα
 ἔργα καὶ πᾶσάν | γε δὴ τὴν ἐκείνου κατασκευὴν κατακοσμήσουσιν 15
- 421 λόγοις καὶ μουσικῇ. | καὶ ταῦτα οὐ ποιηταὶ μόνοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες
 ἄνθρωποι προσομολογοῦσι | τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα ἢ ψυχαγωγίαν ἢ χρεῖαν ὥς
 ἐπὶ πλεῖστον εἰπεῖν ἔχει, | μόνον δὲ τοῦτο μάλιστα γε ἄμφω πληροῖ καὶ μετὰ
 τῶν ὠφελειῶν τὴν | χάριν θαυμαστὴν ἔχει, ὥστε καὶ ὅταν εἰς πολέμους
 ἀλλήλοις ἔλθωσιν | ἄνθρωποι, τοὺς παρὰ τῶν αὐτοχείρων πρέσβεις 20
 ἀφικνουμένους δέχονται | καὶ ἀποπέμπουσιν, ἐνθυμούμενοι [τὸ τῶν
 ῥητόρων φῦλον, ὑπεξαιρούμενοι] τὴν τοῦ λόγου φύσιν [αἰδούμενοι], ὅτι ἐξ 1
 ἀρχῆς ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ καὶ | κοινῇ χρεῖᾳ τοῦ γένους εἰσῆλθεν.

(Aristid. 2,417-21 (1,276-78 L.-B.))

Aristides here contrasts oratory with beauty (κάλλος) trying to subordinate the latter to former:

(417) “I say that when beauty and oratory are present together, the verdict will go to oratory, and that no one will view a handsome man with more pleasure than he will hear his words.”⁸

Iliad 3.224 is quoted to support his argument: Odysseus is to be admired for the loftiness of his diction and his style of oratory which Homer compares to a storm.⁹

Over the next two paragraphs (418-9) Aristides discusses two poetic quotations through which he aims to demonstrate the importance and superiority of his art. Homer and Pindar are at issue. In the quotation from *Od.* 8.169-70, Homer very elaborately employs a sophisticated metaphor where the god compensates for the lack of beauty with the crown of eloquence. In Aristides' view ‘eloquence’, according to Homer, acts as a maintenance of equilibrium and compensation against physical beauty. This quotation from Homer illustrates the supremacy that oratory holds over the human sphere. On the

⁸. Cf. schol. Aristid.3,429 Dind.

⁹. As Behr observes (Aristides 1986: vol.I.458 n.298): literally “an omen from the sky”; *Il.* 3.222.

other hand its unrivalled value for the world of the gods as well, is presented through the poetry of Pindar.

Pindar Fr. *31

HYMNI FR. *31 (7)

<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ ?>

Πίνδαρος ... ἐν Διὸς γάμῳ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτοὺς φησιν ἐρομένου τοῦ Διός, | εἴ του δέοιντο, αἰτῆσαι ποιήσασθαι τινὰς αὐτῷ θεοὺς, οἵτινες τὰ μεγάλα ταῦτ' ἔργα | καὶ πᾶσάν γε τὴν ἐκείνου κατασκευὴν (κατὰ) κοσμήσουσι λόγοις καὶ μουσικῇ.

I. Aristid. 2,420 (1,277 L.-B.);

II. Choric. Gaz. Or. 13,1 (p.175 Foerst. Richt.), 1. ἐποίησε Πίνδαρος καὶ θεοὺς ὀκνοῦντας ὑμνῆσαι τὰς τοῦ Διὸς εἰς ἀνθρώπους φιλοτιμίας. ἐδόκει γάρ, οἶμαι, τῷ ποιητῇ τοῦτο εἶναι μέγιστον ἐγκώμιον τοῦ Διός, εἰ μηδεὶς τῶν Ὀλυμπίων αὐτὸν ἐγκωμιάσαι τολμήσει. 2. τοιγαροῦν καθῆστο μὲν ὁ Ζεὺς τῷ Πινδάρῳ τὸ πᾶν ἄρτι κοσμήσας, παρῆσαν δὲ οἱ θεοὶ σιωπῇ τεθηπότες τὴν ἀγλαίαν τῶν ὀρωμένων, ἐρομένου δὲ τοῦ Διός, εἴπερ ἄλλου του δέοιντο, ἐν ἔφασαν οἱ θεοὶ τοῖς ἐκείνου δημιουργήμασι λείπειν, ὅτι μηδένα προήγαγεν ἀναβαίνοντα ταῖς εὐφημίαις ἄχρι τοῦ μέτρου τῶν τελουμένων. *qui lovem τὸ πᾶν ἄρτι κοσμήσαντα deos haec interrogavisse dicit. ad Musarum ortum spectare videntur.*

Aristides' paraphrase of the poet's words serves as a focusing device pointing out the need of oratory on every occasion even in celebrating divine achievements. We can assume that this connection is implied in the phrase κατακοσμήσουσιν λόγοις καὶ μουσικῇ where λόγοις refers to the need of an appropriate speech. Pindar's λόγοις in Aristides' context acquires a new interpretation: Pindar, as we shall see later on,¹⁰ implied the importance of poetry for the world whereas Aristides probably thought of that of oratory. Aristides expected some at least of his readers / audience to comprehend and appreciate that subtle connection he attempted.

Aristides, who is one of our principal sources for Pindaric *hymn*-literature generally in antiquity,¹¹ clearly marks this quotation as Pindaric. He mentions the poet's name unequivocally and comments on what he calls Pindar's 'exaggeration' (Πίνδαρος δὲ τοσαύτην ὑπερβολὴν ἐποίησατο) before paraphrasing a part of the hymn that is mainly concerned with the theme of extolling Zeus' creation.

The praise of Aristides deals with Zeus mainly as the creator,¹² and this quotation may well have come from the famous hymn that dealt especially with the glorification of

¹⁰. Cf. pp.67-8.

¹¹. He is our solitary testimony for *frs.*32, *31, *35a, *38 and 48.

¹². Caldwell 1989: 169-71.

creation and the inability of the gods to praise it worthily. The paraphrase of this episode of Zeus' glorification, was possibly intended as part of his argument to support the character of his art as *techne*.¹³ Aristides chooses Homer and Pindar to back up his argument concerning the true power and the supremacy that the art of oratory has not only over humans (Homer), but also over gods. From this point of view his quote fits properly into the context of the argument and in terms of its role in Aristides' rhetorical agenda serves as a *mythological exemplum*.

The translation of Aristides testimony will be:

(420) “Pindar went so far that he says that in the marriage of Zeus, upon Zeus asking the gods if they desired anything, they requested that he create for himself gods who would honour in words and music these great deeds and all of his preparations”.

ἐν Διὸς γάμῳ:

This phrase made many critics¹⁴ assume that the main subject matter that Pindar treated in this lost hymn, was the *marriage of Zeus*. This hymn was probably known in antiquity by the name of *Διὸς γάμος*, and from this point of view Aristides' testimony is important in informing us about the ordinary way that ancient critics used to make reference to this Pindaric composition.

A comparison of this testimony with *fr.*30.5*, suggests that Pindar here ignores Hesiod's account (*Th.* 886-900) in making Themis Zeus' first wife for he makes Metis the first and Themis the second; however, Pindar follows Hesiod in making Themis the mother of the Hours (*fr.* 30.5).

ἐρομένου τοῦ Διός:

The answer of the gods, having the form of a succinct reply, is preserved in the paraphrase as a divine request (αἰτῆσαι). The third person singular verb φησιν suggests that Aristides paraphrases from the Pindaric text. The idea of making Zeus ask the gods is Hesiod's but its wording is Pindaric, and in Aristides' paraphrase has the form of the indirect interrogative sentence (ἐρομένου τοῦ Διὸς εἰ τοῦ δέοιντο). Pindar here, on the

¹³. See §§362-437, which concerns with the power of the true orator.

¹⁴. Cf. Farnell 1930: 290; *id.* 1961: 390.

occasion of Zeus' wedding, points out the need for the creation of those gods who will be assigned the task of the exaltation of Zeus' ἔργα and κατασκευή. We can assume here that Pindar, in the request that the other gods put forward to Zeus himself, envisages in some way the creation of Muses¹⁵. Pindar probably tried to say that the world is incomplete without poetry; (although the Muses in Homer and Hesiod give knowledge, in the context of Pindar's hymn the point at issue is *celebration*).¹⁶

Having led the successful rebellion against the Titans, Zeus is now the new master of the universe. He has also accomplished the work of procreation and he has ensured that his reign will be permanent. The only remaining task is that of the celebration and praise of his deeds with musical composition and nice speeches. Pindar, giving in that way factual information about the real value and importance of poetry, aims indirectly at praise of his work. He could not have expressed more fittingly what poetry means to the world.

καὶ ταῦτα οὐ ποιηταὶ μόνοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες ἄνθρωποι προσομολογοῦσι:

This is to be considered as a transitional formula which makes the paraphrase fit properly into the context of Aristides' argument. In his narration the Gods replied with a petition to Zeus that he should create new deities endowed with power of music and poetry to celebrate “*die unbegreiflich hohen Werke*”. In *fr.*31* music and poetry are illustrated as two elements that can not be separated from the world which looks incomplete without them. What Aristides wants to imply here is this: just as music is important and necessary for the world, on this analogy rhetoric is important to the world as well. He adds this sentence because he wants to make the connection between [Pindar+poetry] and [rhetoric+Aristides]. As Pindar's poetry is important to the world, thus Aristides' oratory is by analogy equally important.

¹⁵. This allusion, together with *Nem.* VII.79 where the Muse herself welds together gold, ivory and coral for Sogenes, are the only passages in Pindar where the Muse herself is described as fashioning a poem or garland; elsewhere the Muses are in attendance (or are invited to attend) or assist the poet. The Muses themselves are also said to actually do the singing at the weddings of Cadmus and Harmonia and of Peleus and Thetis. Cf. *Pyth.* III.88ff.; *Nem.* V.22ff.

¹⁶. Muses were regarded in the tradition of Homer and Pindar as the ultimate source of knowledge, cf. *Il.* 2.484-86; *Pae.* VI. 54-57, and less explicitly, *Th.* 28, 31-2.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* *31

Sections from the hymn were selected for anthologies, and later authors like Clemens, Favorinus and Hephaestion (cf. *fr.***34 τὸ Πινδαρικὸν καλούμενον), quoted from this sort of collection.

On the other hand, people did still read complete texts of Pindar, or at least the hymn *to Zeus* whose place of honour was granted by the Alexandrians to the beginning of the book of *Hymns*.

Strabo quoted verbatim ten lines (*fr.**33d) – for part of which we have papyrological support (*PSI* 14, 1391 *fr.*1 col.2),– and this suggests that he used an edition; there is evidence that Pindar's text circulated in early Roman times.¹⁷ This can also be assumed for Theophrastus, who quotes six lines (*fr.*33c), and for Aristides. The orator quotes in paraphrase what must have been a long section of the hymn.

In identifying Aristides' source we have to consider the following possibilities:

1. Aristides either read the whole hymn and produced an *original paraphrase* for himself, or
2. he used a paraphrase of the hymn either found in a mythological handbook, or it was produced by a schoolmaster to be used as a model for his students.

Without denying to Aristides the credit of possible *original paraphrase*, it seems equally likely that the hymn was paraphrased for educational purposes in antiquity.¹⁸ The students under the γραμματικός and especially in higher education had to memorise, to transcribe, and to paraphrase selected passages from the «ἐγκριθέντες» of every literary genre. Pindar undoubtedly heads the list from the lyric poets. The paraphrases of poetic texts in particular, occupied an important position in the educational praxis, in training the students:

- a. to relieve a poetic text from the congestion of its embellishment, and
- b. to familiarise themselves with the author to such an extent as to be able to imitate his ideas and style.

¹⁷ Irigoin 1952: 93-7. The contexts in Lucian and Plutarch show that both were familiar with the content of the hymn. Lucian's tradition is independent from that of Plutarch: Lucian omits ἀνδρῶν (l.2), and preserves three more lines than Plutarch (ll. 6-7).

¹⁸ For the importance of paraphrase see Introduction 3.6.

Therefore, Aristides may have paraphrased this Pindaric hymn as part of his school training, which preserved it in a shorter form, preferring to quote the prose version instead of the original lines.

It is also possible that the hymn was excerpted and utilised by the ancient mythographers and compilers of mythological *compendia*, διηγήσεις, περιοχαί, since the quoted myth was particularly popular in Greek literature from Homer and Hesiod down to Latin poetry.¹⁹ Aristides is likely to have made use of such material whenever he needed a quick reference to similar myths.

The quotation of *fr.*31* in the paraphrase of rhetor Choricus of Gaza²⁰ naturally follows Aristides' tradition. I consider Choricus' testimony as a free adaptation of Aristides' paraphrase. In the beginning of the sixth century when he writes only the *epinicians* circulated.²¹ He preserves 30 quotations from the *Epinicians* and 5 from the other books. Therefore he does not represent an independent line for the tradition of the text, since he does not preserve more information about the hymn. In the first two sentences the Gods are presented to be in a state of hesitation in praising Zeus for his φιλοτιμία. They stay mute in front of Zeus' glowing achievements.²²

¹⁹. See Hes. *Th.* 135, 901; Apollod. 1.3.1, 4.1; Hom. *Od.* 2.68; *Il.* 15.87; 20.4; Pausan. 1.22.1; 5.14.8; 9.22.1; 25.4; 10.5.3; Diod. Sic. 5.67; Ovid. *Met.* 1.321; 4.642; Apoll. Rhod. 4.800; Servius on Virgil's *Aeneid* 4.246. See also Smith 1867 s.v. Themis, cf. Gantz 1993 s.v. Themis.

²⁰. Choricus Gazaeus, *Or.* 13,1 εἰς τὰ τοῦ Βασιλέως Ἰουστινιανοῦ Βρονμάλια ἐκ τοῦ προχείρου, (ed. Foerster-Richtsteig, p.175) *qui Iovem τὸ πᾶν ἄρτι κοσμήσαντα deos haec interrogavisse dicit. ad Musarum ortum spectare videntur.* For *fr.95* Choricus follows Aristides' interpretation.

²¹. He sides himself with those authors who quote with more frequency *Nemeans* (6) than *Isthmians* (1). According to Irigoien (1952: 96,100), this tendency is observed after the time of the choice of the Pindaric text.

²². Choricus considers that the biggest ἐγκώμιον for Zeus is if none of the Olympians would dare to praise him.

II.1.1 Aristid. 43(1), 2, 347, 2-3K = Pind. Fr.*35a.

Introduction to *Or.* XLIII (1) *Εἰς Δία*

In early February AD 149 in an unsuccessful attempt to sail from Clazomenae to Phocaea (see *Or.* XLIII.12), Aristides nearly suffered shipwreck in a storm. In the moment of peril he prayed to Asclepius and Zeus and back at Smyrna, in requital of a vow made then, he delivered his speech “*εἰς Δία*”.²³

This speech, in the prose-hymn style, is according to Behr, “*the most important single document of Aristides' resolution of polytheism. Here Aristides explained the seemingly overlapping and conflicting roles of the Hellenic Gods... by a theory of delegation of power*”.²⁴

Aristides' context

In this hymn Aristides paints a clear picture of Zeus as a supreme deity who delegates his authority to the rest of the Hellenic pantheon.²⁵

Aristides' religious conception of Zeus owes much to Plato, the Stoics, and the Orphics.²⁶ In Aristides' theology, Zeus was the paramount god for whom he had great respect. This is an ingrained religious conception which underlies the last section of the hymn (§§29-31). The orator recapitulating the main attributes of the god as they have been illustrated in the preceding paragraphs (7-13), quotes also a series of characterisations, established epithets, and brief mythological references concerning the god Zeus. According to his account, Zeus is depicted as the great world creator, supreme deity, in whose hands resides all power, even the control of destiny οὗτος ἀπάντων ἀρχὰς καὶ πέρατα καὶ μέτρα καὶ καιροὺς ἔχων, ἴσον πανταχοῦ πάντων κρατῶν.²⁷ Aristides employs in the sphragis of his prose-hymn devotional vocabulary which consists of traditional epithets and hymnal addresses of the God.

The attributes of the God are organised in two comprehensive categories:

23. Amann (1931: 4, 13, 34, 36), dated this speech in AD 143 in Alexandria, and regarded it as Aristides' first; cf. Wilamowitz 1925: 339. He supposed that the storm took place on the way to Egypt. Boulanger 1923: 122-3, 161 also places it in Alexandria. For a discussion on the different dates suggested cf. Behr 1968a: 73 n.44.

24. Behr *op. cit.* 73.

25. For Aristides' faith to Zeus and its union with other deities (e.g. Sarapis, Asclepius) see *Ibid* 72-3 n.44, 151-2.

26. *Ibid* 151-2.

27. Cf. §§ 7-13, 27; cf. also *Ors.* II.166; XXXVII.2; XLIV.11; XLV.22 (the same characteristics are attributed to Sarapis as well); XXVI.105.

- a. Traditional expressions illustrating the god's role (cf. §29; 30.28ff.).
 b. Characteristic epithets of the god on various occasions (cf. §30.23-7).

The supreme god is invoked as:

<i>Expressions for the god</i>		<i>Epithets of the god</i>	
πάντων πατήρ διὰ τοῦτον ὀρώμεν εὐεργέτης προστάτης ἔφορος πρύτανις ἡγεμών	ταμίας δοτήρ ἀπάντων ποιητής ἀπάντων ἀρχᾶς καὶ πέρα- τα καὶ μέτρα καὶ και-ρούς ἔχων: ἴσον πανταχοῦ πάντων κρατῶν	Ἀγοραῖος Τροπαῖος Σωτήρ Ἐλευθέριος Μειλίχιος πατήρ Βασιλεύς Πολιεύς	Καταιβάτης Ἰέτιος Οὐράνιος Κορυφαῖος ἡγεμόνα βοηθὸν ἀρχηγέτην τέλειον

Keil sees a Homeric pattern (*Od.* 2.47) for the 3 adjectives Μειλίχιος, πατήρ and Βασιλεύς; however, a careful examination suggests that for some of Aristides' epithets the pattern might be Pindaric, since more than a third of them is attested in his poetry in an identical or similar form:

Σωτήρ ὑψιφεφές Ζεῦ	Ζηνὸς Ἐλευθερίου	Ζεὺς πατήρ	Ζεὺς... βασιλεύς	οὐρανίου Διὸς	Ζεὺς τέλει'
<i>Ol.</i> V. 17.; <i>fr.</i> 30.5	<i>Ol.</i> XII. 1	<i>Ol.</i> II.27; VII.87; XIII.26; <i>Pyth.</i> IV. 23; III.98; <i>Nem.</i> VIII.35; IX.31, 53; X.29, 55; <i>Isth.</i> VI. 42; <i>fr.</i> 93	<i>Nem.</i> V.35; <i>Isth.</i> VIII. 18; cf. <i>Ol.</i> VII. 34; <i>Nem.</i> VII. 82; X.16	<i>fr.</i> 52u.9; <i>Pyth.</i> IV. 194	<i>Pyth.</i> I.67. cf. <i>Nem.</i> X. 29

Christian²⁸ and Hellenistic²⁹ views are also echoed in the nature and the choice of the epithets for the god. An echo from Judaic³⁰ hymnologic texts is also probable. Long chains of epithets for gods also occur in *orphic hymns* and *Magic papyri*.

28. Cf. the following parallels between the writings of Aristides and the tradition of the *New Testament* and especially the Gospels, for which I have drawn on van der Horst (1980): 1. *Arist.* §29.18 (Ζεὺς πάντων πατήρ) : *Eph.* IV 6 (εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατήρ πάντων); *Arist.* §29 : *Col.* I 15-20. (See the remarks of Pöhlmann 1973: 53-74 esp.60). Γιαχβέ is commonly called πατήρ in *O'* see Schürer 1909: vol.III. 407; 2. *Arist.* §29.21 (ἔφορος) : 1 *Ptr.* II 25; 3. *Arist.* §30.28-32.5 (οὗτος ἀπάντων ἀρχᾶς καὶ πέρατα καὶ μέτρα καὶ καιρούς ἔχων, ἴσον πανταχοῦ πάντων κρατῶν.... ἀπὸ τούτου ἀρχεσθαι χρή καὶ τελευτᾶν εἰς τοῦτον) : *Apoc.* XXI 6 and XXII 13 (ἐγὼ... ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος), cf. *Aristid.* XLV. 22 (Sarapis). See van Unnik, 1976 on *Arist.* cf. 52ff.; 4. *Arist.* §31.7 (τέλειον) : *Mt.* V 48; 5. *Arist.* §30.27 (Οὐράνιος) : *Mt.* V 48; 6. *Arist.* §30.25 (Σωτήρ) : *Lk.* I 47; *Acts* XIII 23,1, cf. *Arist.* L.32 (Apollo) and XXXIX.3 (Asclepius); 7. *Arist.* §30.2 (αὐτὸς ἄν μόνος) : *Lk.* V 21; *John* V 4; *Rom.* XVI 27. See Dellling 1970: 391-400. 8. *Arist.* §30.27 (Ἰέτιος) : *Acts* XIV 17; 9. *Arist.* §30.23 (νίκη διδούς) : 1 *Cor.* XV 57; 10. *Arist.* §30.25 (Ἐλευθέριος) : *Gal.* V 1; 11. *Arist.* §31.6 (βοηθὸν) : *Hebr.* XIII 6; 12. *Arist.* §31.6 (ἀρχηγέτην) : *Hebr.* XII 2.

29. Cf. *Call. hymn 1 (to Zeus)* sphragis; *Cleant. hymn to Zeus*, ll.370-408; *Aratus Phaen.* 1-18 (Invocation to Zeus). Aristides' account could also make us to recall the first three lines of *Homeric Hymn* (23) to Zeus: "I will sing of Zeus, chiefest among the gods and greatest all-seeing, the fulfiller who whispers words of wisdom to Themis as she sits learning towards him" (tr. Evelyn -White, Loed ed.).

30. The older books of *O'* are more sparing of divine epithets, whereas, in the later ones an accumulation of adjuncts is attempted by Greek-speaking Judaeans in order to counterpoise the many names of ethnic gods; cf. Kopidakis 1987: 53.

The “λέξις” and “φράσις” of Aristides' aretology of Zeus (§§29-31), indicates similarities with Christian hymnal addresses and devotional vocabulary of the God as well as Jewish invocations of ΓΙΧΒΕ. This can be seen further in the stylistic, lexical, grammatical, and ethical parallels between Aristides and *N.T.* scholars collected by van der Horst (1980). According to Lane Fox, the worship of the “most high” gods owed – but by no means always – a debt to the religious language of the local Jewish community. Perhaps it should be stressed here that similarities in wording or phrasing or ideas do not imply some form of mutual dependency between Aristides and *N.T.*

In the section of sphragis (§§29-31), we can further point out the following stylistic similarities common in hymnal language:

a. The πᾶς (–ᾶπας), its components, derivatives, and generally terms indicating universality are of the principally hymnal vocabulary attested in Greek cultic texts,³¹ in *N.T.*,³² and in the translation of LXX' (19 out of 88 in *Macab.*III qualifies ΓΙΧΒΕ).³³ Aristides uses πᾶς 12 times here, which is a characteristic of “hyperbolischer Stil” and can be explained as a Christian and Jewish influence.

b. Aristides in paragraphs (29-31), accumulates a number of participles qualifying the paramount god. This construction (πυκνομετοχία) –characteristic of dithyrambic style–,³⁴ is attested in prayers in LXX'.³⁵

c. The use of αὐτός, relative pronouns and pronominal adverbs in cult hymns introduce descriptions the god's powers, and in the rhapsodic hymns are used to introduce the central normative illustrating the god's greatness. In Pindar relative pronouns often introduce mythical exempla.³⁶

The image of omnipotence of Zeus, through this accumulation of epithets and characterisations from the previous literature, suggests a concept which brings Aristides close to monotheism. Such a belief was prevalent in Aristides' time, which was drifting into ‘monotheism’.³⁷

³¹. Norden 1971: 241-50; Keyssner 1932: 28-46; cf. Deichgräber 1933: 351ff. See Philem. fr. 91K for a parody of this stylistic phenomenon.

³². Pöhlmann 1973: 53-74.

³³. Th. Wört. V, 889. 7-9: “Neben und nach κύριος, das etwa 8000 mal im griechischen AT vorkommt, ist πᾶς mit 6-7000 Stellen die häufigste Vokabel der griechischen Bibel von begrifflichen Bedeutung”.

³⁴. Gildersleeve 1888: 145.

³⁵. Kopidakis 1987: 59.

³⁶. Bundy 1986: 8 with n.27.

³⁷. In this developed theology, pagan hymns honour a pagan god as “one” or combine its name with several others, cf. Lane Fox 1986: 34-5, with ns.24 (: esp. Peterson 1926: 268-70), and 25. Nilsson 1950: vol.2, 540, argues that behind Aristides' exaltation of individual gods is the tendency of the time to

At this point Aristides introduces two quotations. The first comes from Pindar, the second from Homer's *Iliad*.³⁸

XLIII. (1) ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ.

- 29 Ζεὺς πάντων πατήρ [καὶ ποταμῶν] | καὶ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ θεῶν
καὶ ἀνθρώπων <καὶ ζώων> καὶ φυτῶν, | καὶ διὰ τοῦτον ὀρῶμεν καὶ ἔχομεν 20
ὅποσα καὶ ἔχομεν. οὗτος ἀπάντων | εὐεργέτης καὶ προστάτης καὶ ἔφορος,
οὗτος πρύτανις καὶ ἡγεμῶν | καὶ ταμίας ὄντων τε καὶ γιγνομένων
30 ἀπάντων, οὗτος δοτὴρ ἀπάντων, οὗτος ποιητής. οὗτος ἐν μὲν ἐκκλησίαις
καὶ δίκαις νίκην | διδούς Ἀγοραῖος κέκληται, ἐν δὲ μάχαις Τροπαῖος, ἐν δὲ
νόσοις | καὶ πᾶσιν καιροῖς βοηθῶν Σωτήρ, οὗτος Ἐλευθέριος, οὗτος 25
Μειλίχιος —, εἰκότως, ἅτε καὶ πατήρ—, οὗτος Βασιλεύς, Πολιεύς, |
Καταιβάτης, Ὑέτιος, Οὐράνιος, Κορυφαῖος, πάνθ' ὅσα αὐτὸς εὔρεν | μεγάλα
καὶ ἑαυτῷ πρέποντα ὀνόματα· οὗτος ἀπάντων ἀρχὰς καὶ | πέρατα καὶ 1
μέτρα καὶ καιροὺς ἔχων, ἴσον πανταχοῦ πάντων κρατῶν, αὐτὸς ἂν μόνος
εἰπὼν ἃ χρὴ περὶ αὐτοῦ, θεὸς ἅτε πλέον | τι λαχὼν· τοῦτο γὰρ οὖν
31 Πινδάρῳ κάλλιον ἢ ἄλλ' ὅτιοῦν ὁτρωοῦν | εἴρηται περὶ Διός. ἀπὸ
τούτου ἄρχεσθαι χρὴ καὶ τελευτᾶν εἰς | τοῦτον, παντὸς λόγου καὶ πάσης 5
πράξεως ἡγεμόνα καὶ βοηθὸν | καλοῦντας, ὥσπερ εἰκὸς τὸν ἀπάντων
κρατοῦντα ἀρχηγέτην καὶ | τέλειον μόνον αὐτὸν ὄντα τῶν πάντων.

(Aristid. 43 (1) 2,346-47,2-4 K).

Aristides, looking for a striking and emphatic expression to culminate in that way his praise to the supreme of the gods, resorts to the first hymn of Pindar. This *hymn to Zeus* held a pre-eminent place among the whole hymnal poetical production of antiquity concerning the praise of Zeus. Pindar's words themselves function as a sort of *hymnal decoration*: Aristides wants to embellish his prose-hymn to the God with a masterpiece from Pindar. Explaining his choice he observes: “*For Pindar has expressed this better than anything else said by anyone about Zeus*”.

syncretism and monotheism. Cf. also Moreschini 1994: 1237 (on second century ‘enoteismo’), and Weinreich 1914: 605.

³⁸. The hymnic model ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα of *Il.* 9.97 is a source for the end of Aristides' prose-hymn. With the same words begin Theoc.'s 17th *Idyll* and Arat. *ph.* 1, cf. *Nem.* II.1-3. Aristides in his reference to Homer reverses the order of the verbs in the original text. In *Iliad* 9 Agamemnon is credited with the Zeus' privilege to decide what is θέμις and what is not. See Hainsworth 1993: *ad loc.*: “*Nestor's compliments ἐν σοὶ μὲν λήξω, σέο δ' ἄρξομαι is the language in which the singers of hymns apostrophized a god*”.

Evidently the hymn was famous in later antiquity as we can judge from the quotations that preserve parts of the ode; theological grounds (honour to Zeus)³⁹ secured for this poem, in the Alexandrian editions, its rank as the first in the collection of Pindar's *hymns*. Therefore, its long-continued reputation throughout antiquity made Pindar's words appropriate for Aristides' *peroration* to his oration *εἰς Δία*. Pindar's phrase: “*only God himself could speak worthily about himself*”, is considered by Aristides as the highest praise in favour of Zeus in regard to the works of creation.⁴⁰

The orator gives us a prose paraphrase of this lost part of the hymn:

αὐτὸς ἂν μόνος εἰπὼν ἂ χρεὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ, θεὸς ἅτε πλέον | τι λαχὼν τοῦτο
γὰρ οὖν Πινδάρῳ κάλλιον ἢ ἄλλ' ὅτιοῦν ὅτρωοῦν | εἴρηται περὶ Διός.

We can here take τοῦτο as referring to the preceding quoted statement and not to the sentence that follows. The words that precede, πλέον τι λαχὼν, have the true Pindaric ring and are Pindar's own, as Wilamowitz has perceived: “*having received from Destiny some greater power*”.⁴¹

Frs. *31 & *35a in Aristides' texts

As we pointed out before, Aristides' testimony is our solitary source for a considerable number of fragments from this Pindaric hymn, which undoubtedly suggests that Aristides had a sufficient knowledge of the hymn's contents. From this collection, the fragments *31 & *35a cohere with each other dealing with the inability of the gods to praise Zeus worthily and how only Zeus himself can do this appropriately. Consequently, from this point of view, the quotation of *fr.* *35a might be considered as the natural continuation of *fr.* *31, which Aristides quoted two/three years before in the last section of his speech “*In Defence of the oratory*”.

³⁹. The first six books in Aristophanes' edition belong to the religious sphere, cf. Pfeiffer 1968: 184. Cf. Callimachus' *hymns*.

⁴⁰. Zeus is depicted in the archaic poetry as τέλειος. This tradition about Zeus is also followed by Pindar in addressing him as: Ζεῦ τέλει *Ol.* XIII.115; Ζεὺς ὁ πάντων κύριος *Isth.* V.53, etc. See on that Amann 1931: 108, cf. Schroeder 1923: 141; Gerhard 1959: 40-4; Fogelmark 1972: 49ff. See also Lehnus 1979: 196-7 with ns. 31, 35.

⁴¹. Wilamowitz 1922: 190 with n.1. Pindar uses often this expression: *Pyth.* VIII.88 καλὸν τι νέον λαχὼν; cf. *Pyth.* X.20.

The combination of the evidences from the Aristidian tradition suggests that the Pindaric hymn circulated as a whole in 2nd cent. AD; this appears from the manner in which the fragments *31 and *35a are cited. I believe that both fragments preserved in Aristides' texts do not only belong to the same hymn, but in addition may have been consecutive in the original text: the question posed in the paraphrase finds its solution in *fr.*35a: "only god himself could speak worthily about himself (concerning the works of creation)"*.⁴²

Finally, we can assume from Aristides' testimony (*fr.*35a*) that Apollo and the Muses, while honouring Cadmos and Harmonia, in their mythological account celebrated also the creation of order and harmony in the universe by the rule of Zeus. Such a great achievement, being a fitting subject for the wedding of Cadmos, could be glorified only by Zeus himself "*as a god with a greater portion*".

⁴². It is therefore reasonably probable that *frs.* 31 & *35a follow the other theogonic instances described in the mythological account that was sung by Apollo and the Muses.

II.1.1 Aristid. 3, 620 (1,498 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr. 32.

Plato engaging in a digression at *Grg.* (501d1–502d8), points out in passing that his condemnation of rhetoric applies equally to certain other types of public performance, and in particular to the dithyrambic compositions and tragedy. Socrates claims, and Callicles agrees, that these performances along with the playing of αὐλός, κιθάρα and singing, aim solely at giving pleasure to the audience.

Aristides' context

These Platonic views constitute for Aristides another point of departure in pointing out that Plato's slander was contradictory, inconsistent and superfluous (§§612–21). In particular, according to Aristides, Plato is contradictory in his accusation against comedy and tragedy since he used in his treatises comic elements and admitted that he was “*a poet of tragedy*”.⁴³ By the same test Aristides undermines Plato's charge about Dithyramb (cf. *Grg.* 502a), since he clearly honours it and admits use of it. “*For somewhere he says in these words that ‘he does not speak in a manner far different from the dithyrambs’*” (cf. *Phdr.* 238d).

III. (XLVI D.) ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΤΤΑΡΩΝ.

619 καίτοι εἰ καθάπαξ αἰσχρὸν ὁ διθύραμβος καὶ ἀγεννὲς καὶ ἀνελεύθερον, τί σὺ
ποιεῖς διθυράμβους, εἰ δὲ μή, μιμῆ γε, καὶ ταῦτ' εἰς τοὺς | πεζοὺς τελεῖν
ταχθεῖς; ἢ τί σοι βούλεται τὸ μὴ πόρρω διθυράμβων | φθέγγεσθαι; οὐ γὰρ δὴ 5
τοῦτο λέγεις, μὴ πόρρω τῶν κολάκων καὶ τῶν | διακόνων φθέγγεσθαι, οὔτε
σὺ φαίης ἂν τοῦτό γε οὔθ' ἡμεῖς κατὰ σοῦ | πιστεύσομεν, ἢ κομιδῇ πάντ'
620 ἄνω καὶ κάτω γίγνοιτ' ἂν. ἡγοῦμαι μὲν | τοίνυν καὶ διθυράμβων εἶναι
Πλάτωνα ποιητὴν ἄριστον· πῶς γὰρ οὐ; | οὐ μὲν οὐδὲ τῶν Πινδάρου
διθυράμβων ὅτι χρή καταγνῶναι τοιοῦτον | οἷον Πλάτων ἐπητιάσατο 10
ἔγωγ' ἔχω, οὐ μόνον αὐτὸ τοῦτο τοὺς διθυράμβους σκοπῶν ἀνδρειότερον
δήπουθεν ἔχοντας καὶ στερεώτερον ἢ ὥς | ἐκεῖνόν τῳ δοκεῖν ὑποπίπτειν,
ἀλλ' ὅτι κὰν τοῖς ὕμνοις διεξιῶν περὶ | τῶν ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ χρόνῳ
συμβαινόντων παθημάτων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ | τῆς μεταβολῆς τὸν

⁴³ *Lg.* 817b. More specifically, tragedy may be described as a branch of ῥητορική δημηγορία 502d2, since it employs a verbal medium to gratify the audience.

Κάδμον φησὶν ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μουσικὰν | ὀρθὰν 15
 ἐπιδεικνυμένου. οὕτω καὶ Πίνδαρος τῆς ὀρθῆς μουσικῆς ἐραστὴς | ἐστίν. [τὸ
 δ' ἐραστὴς ἐστίν, τὴν ὀρθὴν μουσικὴν μεταχειρίζεται.] οὐ γὰρ | δῆπου τῷ μὲν
 Ἀπόλλωνι ταύτην προστίθουσιν, αὐτὸς δ' ἐτέραν διώκει | ταύτην ἀφείς, καὶ
 621 ταῦτ' αἰεὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλω καὶ τὰς Μούσας καλῶν. εἴτα | λέγεις ὅτι πάντες
 οὗτοι τοῦ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐξήρτηνται. πότερον οὖν σε | φῶμεν ἑλαττον τοῦ 20
 δέοντος λέγειν ἢ πλεόν; ὅτι μὲν γὰρ καὶ τοῦ πρὸς | ἡδονὴν φροντίζουσιν
 ὁμολογεῖται.

(Aristid. 3,619-21 (1,498 L.-B.))

Over the next two paragraphs (619-20) Aristides continues to point out logical inconsistencies by Plato who composed and wrote dithyrambs although he considered this literary genre as shameful, ignoble, and servile. He questions the soundness and the application of Plato's charge against Pindar's dithyrambic compositions. In an eloquent rhetorical style Aristides makes the defence of Pindar's dithyrambs a matter of literary criticism. He vigorously reviles Plato's views:

(620) “Nor indeed can I see that the dithyrambs of Pindar should be condemned on charges of the sort which Plato made against them; and I observe that Pindar's dithyrambs not only have this very quality which is too courageous and firm for Pindar to seem to cringe before anyone...”

Aristides writes in a more mature stage of his career (AD 161-5). His knowledge of Pindar's poetry has now become deeper; he had mastered his poetry in an earlier age and since then he has quoted it to a considerable extent in his previous rhetorical compositions. He is now well versed in Pindar's style and appears to be in the position to pass criticism and to appreciate aesthetically Pindaric composition in general.

To the orator of the second sophistic movement the poetry of Pindar afforded an easily accessible source upon which to draw for the embellishment or the support of his oration. As in the *defence of oratory*, the words of Pindar are adduced as a proof in his refutation of Plato's charge against the real value of oratory and its character as an art, in a parallel way Pindar is essential here to Aristides' argument about the function and character of all poetry and music.

To buttress effectively his claim for the literary quality of Pindar's dithyrambs, Aristides mentions the first book of Pindar from where he quotes the *fr.32*. Noteworthy is the way that his quotation is introduced:

(620) “even in the Hymns when Pindar narrates the sufferings and change which happens to men throughout time, he says: Κάδμον... ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μουσικὰν ὀρθὰν ἐπιδεικνυμένου”.

As I shall discuss over the next section, the introductory statement that precedes his quotation, is not Aristides' own expression made from his reading of Pindar's hymnal poetry, but the paraphrase of one more verse from the lost hymn.

Pindar Fr.32

Fr.32 is also preserved from Plutarch, who quoted it twice in his *moralia* in almost the same words. The recovered text is the following:

HYMNI FR. *32 (8)

<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ ?>

(Κάδμος ἤκουσε τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος)
⁴³μουσικὰν ὀρθὰν ἐπιδεικνυμένου

I. Aristid. 3,620 (1,498 L.-B.);

II. Plut. *Pyth. orac.* 6 p.397 A ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος (*fr.32*) ἀκοῦσαι φησὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Κάδμον [οὔ] μουσικὰν ὀρθὰν, οὐχ ἡδεῖαν οὐδὲ τρυφερὰν οὐδ' ἐπικεκλασμένην τοῖς μέλεσιν.

III. *id. anim. procr.* 33,6 p.1030 A ὁ δὲ τῷ Πινδάρῳ ποιήσας τὸ ἐπικήδειον ἄρμενος ἦν ξείνοισιν ἀνὴρ ὅδε καὶ φίλος ἀστοῖς εὐαρμοστίαν δηλὸς ἐστὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἡγούμενος ὥς που καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πίνδαρος (*fr.32*) τοῦ θεοῦ φησιν ἐπακοῦσαι μουσικὰν ὀρθὰν ἐπιδεικνυμένου τὸν Κάδμον.

These words probably belong to the *hymn to Zeus*, on the good ground that the metre fits; however we cannot speak with certainty of their place within the poem. Logically they might stand just before the mythological account of the theogonic instances, and the list of Zeus' consorts, that Apollo and the Muses narrated regaling the wedding guests. Aristides' quotation of *fr.32* merely says that Cadmos heard *Apollo* “revealing the true music”, and not that he listened to the singing of the Muses. In this respect Aristides' testimony is in agreement with Plutarch's text who in both cases where he quotes *fr. 32* mentions the noun θεός without naming the god.⁴⁴ Snell, examining

⁴⁴. Castagna (1991: 178), asserts wrongly: “È solo da Plutarco che ci viene testimoniato come il participio ἐπιδεικνυμένου che regge μουσικὰν ὀρθὰν, vada concordato con un genitivo Ἀπόλλωνος, retto da ἤκουσε.”

together Aristides' quotation along with other information concerning it, propounds the presence of the Muses.⁴⁵

Fr. 32 is a praise that Pindar bestowed on the nature of the god's music. What puzzles the reader is the meaning of the word ὀρθάν in its original sense as intended by Pindar and how it has been understood by both Aristides and Plutarch.

Pindar might have dwelt with delight on the real value of the music that Apollo displayed at the wedding feast. Pindar in his poetry has employed the word ὀρθάν as an adjective indicating quality (cf. Slater s.v. ὀρθός, β. *straight, true, regular*: *Ol.* VII.46 ὀρθάν ὁδόν; *Pyth.* IV.227 ὀρθὰς δ' αὐλακας; *Pyth.* XI.39 ὀρθὰν κέλευθον; *fr.* 1a.5 ὀρθῶ δρόμῳ).⁴⁶

According to Aristides' interpretation, Pindar finds in the god's music what is for him the *prototype* of all high songs. According to the orator the poet does not abandon this correct music in becoming its lover, always invoking Apollo and the Muses.⁴⁷ It is interesting to see how Aristides interpreted the Pindaric word ὀρθάν.

Discussing certain literary genres (iambos, comedy, tragedy), Aristides rebukes Plato's remarks that the performance of the dithyramb comes under the head of κολακεία. The poetry of Pindar which is ὀρθή is contrasted to what Plato defined before as αἰσχρόν, ἀγεννές and ἀνελεύθερον (§619), which in Aristides' argument is the opposite of μουσικὰν ὀρθάν.

Pindar speaks of music quite often in his poetry and his images for it convey light and power. A similar treatment of the scene occurs in *Nem.* V.22-6, where the Muses sing and Apollo plays his divine music:⁴⁸

⁴⁵. Snell (1953: 73-4) concludes that Pindar follows an invention of Apollo's function in *Il.* 1.603-4 –as the leader of the Muses in dance and song and accompanying them with his lyre–, and also in *Th.* 36-55; this must be the same also in the *hymn to Zeus*. In favour of Snell's argument, the presence of Muses is also supported by Aristides' text where the Muses are mentioned along with Apollo.

⁴⁶. The nearest approach to it in earlier literature is at Sappho 44.32 *L-P*. The poem describes the rejoicing of the Trojans at the arrival of Hector with his bride Andromache: ...the older women are raising the loud cheerful cry of thanksgiving; the men are singing the paean to Apollo: ἐπήρατον ἴαχον ὄρθιον | πᾶον'..., cf. *h. Hom.Ven.* 20 ἰάχησε... ὄρθια φωνῇ; cf. *Il.* 11.10-1 ἤυσε θεὰ | ... ὄρθι'...

⁴⁷. Cf. schol. Aristid. 3, 721 Dind.

⁴⁸. Similarly, in the opening lines of *Pythian* I Pindar shapes a radiant vision of the task of music on earth, in heaven, and in Tartaros. Beginning with a summons to the lyre, his theme is both human and divine. In general see Schroeder 1922: *Pyth.* 4; Fraccaroli 1894: 340ff.; Schadewaldt 1928: 273. Cf. also *Pyth.* III.93-5; *Nem.* IV.66-8 for the presence of the gods in weddings.

NEMEAN V (483?)
 Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός, ἐν δὲ μέσαις
 ᾠδῶν γὰρ ἁπλόων ἐπτάγλωσσον
 χρυσέῳ πλάκτρῳ διώκων
 — ἀγεῖτο παντοίων νόμων· αἱ δὲ πρῶτιστον μὲν ὕμνη- 25
 σαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν
 (*Nem. V.23-5*)

Plutarch discussing the *fr.* 32 in his *Pyth. orac.* 6 p.397A, correlates Pindar's words to the simplicity and the plain style of the prophetic priestess. The whole ritual and the oracle itself look unembellished, unperfumed, and mirthless in contrast to Sappho's μέλη which are full of charm and bewitching. Using this analogy, Plutarch understands Pindar's μουσικὰν ὀρθάν as the sort of music which can be defined as “*not sweet nor voluptuous nor with suddenly changing melody*”.⁴⁹ By contrast, in Aristides' text the question concerning the pleasure that derives from the poetry is discussed at the next paragraph (621); it seems that Aristides treats this question independently in his quote from Pindar. However, the ‘variation on melody’ that Plutarch suggested can partially be traced in Aristides' οὐ... αὐτὸς δ' ἑτέραν διώκει ταύτην ἀφείς (§620). Nevertheless, Aristides' quotation has to be considered of independent authority. As we have already pointed out he preserves the name of the god and explicitly mentions the literary genre of his quotation. He also preserves in paraphrase one more line (*fr.* *33).

⁴⁹. Schröder (1990: 147), assumes that the term ἐπικεκλασμένην is technical in joining moral and musical explanation. Cadmos gets from the god a simple and exalted music to hear, which avoids with all kinds of musical finesse an effeminate expression.

II.1.1 Aristid. 3, 620 (1,498 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr. *33.

Aristides also reports that Pindar recited in his hymns a tale of the sufferings and of the changes which in the course of time had fallen to the lot of mortals.⁵⁰ I believe that behind the orator's statement can be traced the paraphrase of another section of the *hymn to Zeus* from where must come a verse which Plutarch has preserved verbatim in his *quaest. Plat.* 8,4,3 p.1007B, and in Maehler's edition is printed under the number *33:

HYMNI FR. *33 (133)

<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ ?>

ἄνακτα ὁν πάντων ὑπερ-
βάλλοντα Χρόνον μακάρων

Plut. quaest. Plat. 8, 4, 3 p. 1007B τὴν δ' οὐσίαν (τοῦ χρόνου) καὶ τὴν δύναμιν οὐ συννοῶντες, ἣν ὁ γε Πίνδαρος ἔοικεν οὐ φαύλως ὑπονοῶν εἰπεῖν· ἄνα — μακάρων

Plutarch in the *Ζήτημα η'* discussing the Platonic idea that the planetary system constitutes the main principle in defining the “Χρόνος”, quotes a series of philosophical definitions of what is ‘Time’. He considers these definitions as the result of ἄγνοια like that of Arist. (*Ph.* IV 219B 2a1) ‘μέτρον εἶναι κινήσεως καὶ ἀριθμὸν κατὰ <τὸ> πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον’, or that of Speusippus ‘τὸ ἐν κινήσει ποσόν’.⁵¹ The Stoics also committed the mistake of defining only the substance of ‘Time’, whereas they neglected its power (δύναμις). According to Plutarch, Pindar has succeeded in defining adequately the power of Time. In his quotation from Pindar Χρόνος is illustrated as the ruler of all the blessed gods, and stronger than they.

Pindar Fr. *33

These words on the power of ‘Time’ over divinity belong somewhere in the divine history sung by Apollo and the Muses. In this section Pindar may have regarded Χρόνος as something powerful and inevitable that holds sway over mortals and immortals. It is a logical assumption that Pindar in this section may also have dwelled on (διεξιῶν) the volatility and the sufferings that happen to the human race in the process of

⁵⁰. Snell (1953: 314 n.3), argues that the text is uncertain; cf. Wilamowitz 1922: 190.

⁵¹. Lang 1911: 79, fr.53.

Time, after his invocation to Χρόνος. (*Fr.*33* should be located at the beginning of this section of the poem, according to our knowledge of similar apostrophes in Pindar and other early lyricists). If this is the case Aristides echoes this section, from which *fr.*33* may come from, in his refutation of Plato's charge. This seems to be probable for the following reasons:

1. Aristides' statement (περὶ τῶν ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ χρόνῳ συμβαινόντων παθημάτων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς), comes immediately after the introductory formula ὅτι κὰν τοῖς ὕμνοις διεξιῶν and before his quotation of *fr. 32*; and

2. there is an ideological similarity between Aristides' words and *fr.*33*, and this may suggest that Aristides had in mind ideas that Pindar expressed in this section of the hymn. What Aristides says in his paraphrase are favourite topics and recurring leit-motives in Pindar's poetry, which we are able to identify thanks to Plutarch's quotation.

The source for Pind. *Fr. *33*

When we ask what source Aristides employed for *fr.*33*, we have to compare Pindar's words, as quoted by Plutarch, with the passage in Aristides:

a. The fact that Aristides preserves the information about the literary genre τοῖς ὕμνοις διεξιῶν, suggests that he might have read *fr.*33* as part of the *hymn to Zeus*. On the other hand Plutarch mentions nothing about the hymn in general and his quotation of *fr.*33* has been attributed to the *hymn to Zeus* on metrical grounds. In this respect Aristides' testimony is important in specifying the literary genre.

b. Aristides introduces in his paraphrase two changes which make him depart from Plutarch's text:

i. In Plutarch's context the concept of "Χρόνος" is presented as an abstract,⁵² whereas in Aristides' paraphrase it signifies duration: ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ χρόνῳ. In this respect Aristides' paraphrase recalls *fr.*33b* ἐν χρόνῳ δ' ἔγενετ' Ἀπόλλων, preserved by Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1,21,107,2 (2,69 St.).

ii. Plutarch speaks of the power of 'Time' over the *divinity* (μακάρων), whereas Aristides focuses on the results of its action over the *human level*.

⁵². Pindar is fond of personification of abstracts like Χρόνος, Ἀλάθεια, Ἀγγελία. See Petersen 1939: 23-30; Dover 1974: 141-4; Gianotti 1975: 76-80 (for Χάρις).

II.1.1 Aristid. 43(1), 2, 341-2, 1K = Pind. Fr. 33c.5.

Aristides, in the section §§7-13 of his hymn *εἰς Δία*, refers to the creation of the Universe by Zeus. In a passage which reflects views on the creation of the natural world, the supreme deity is presented as having accomplished his work by setting and securing the four natural elements which compose the Universe (: the earth, the sea, the air, and finally the ether which held the Universe together).⁵³ Finally as the crowning of his achievement “*he adorned the heaven with stars, as the sea with islands*”.

XLIII. (1) ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ.

συνέπλεξέ τε αὐτὰ οὕτως ὥς εἶναι μέσα | ἑκάτερα ἀλλήλων, νήσοις
 τε καὶ πορθμοῖς καὶ ἰσθμοῖς τὸ ἕτερον | τοῦ ἑτέρου αἰεὶ ἐν μέσῳ γιγνόμενον,
 ὥσπερ τὴν γῆν δι' ἑκατέρου | τοῦ σχήματος ὠχύρωσεν, οὕτω τὴν γῆν αὖ 20
 13 καὶ τὴν θάλατταν, δι' ἀλλήλων ἀμφοτέρα ἀσφαλῆ ποιῶν. ἀέρα τε ὑπὲρ
 ἀμφοτέρων ἔστησε, | γῆς καὶ θαλάττης ἀναπνοήν, καὶ πῦρ ἄνωθεν, ὃ δὴ
 αἰθέρα ὀνομάζουσιν, ἐπιστήσας τετάρτῳ τούτῳ τὰ πάντα κατέλαβεν, τῆς
 τε | φιλοτεχνίας τὰ κράτιστα ἐνταῦθα τοῦτ' εἰσηνέγκατο, κοσμήσας | μὲν 1
 ἄστροις τὸν πάντα οὐρανόν, ὥσπερ ταῖς νήσοις τὴν θάλατταν, | καὶ
 δι' αὐτῶν ποιήσας διαφανῆ, τὴν δὲ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπορροήν καταπέμψας μέχρι
 γῆς, οὐκ ἐν ὅσῳ νῦν ἡμεῖς διήλθομεν χρόνῳ περὶ | αὐτῶν ἀποτελεώσας
 ἅπαντα ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ὀξύτερον ἢ νοῆσαι ἐγχαῶρεϊ.

(Aristid. 43 (1) 2,341-42,1 K).

Aristides' context

The thematic material of the paragraph is religious–cosmological, however the language is virtually poetic. The words τῆς τε φιλοτεχνίας τὰ κράτιστα ἐνταῦθα τοῦτ' εἰσηνέγκατο, κοσμήσας μὲν ἄστροις τὸν πάντα οὐρανόν, ὥσπερ ταῖς νήσοις τὴν θάλατταν, suggest that Aristides had in his mind a specific poetic model, which goes back to Pindar's poetry who in the same hymn spoke in similar terms of the birthplace of Apollo and Leto. The text preserved in Theophrastos contained an invocation of Delos, the island in the Aegean where Leto gave birth to Apollo and Artemis.

⁵³. Cf. D.L. VII.137.

Pindar Fr. 33c

It has been possible to assign the *fr.* 33c to the hymn on the grounds that its metrical scheme agrees with the sections which have long been known to belong to the poem (*i.e.* *frs.* 29, *30).⁵⁴

HYMNI FR. 33c =87

<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ ?>

χαῖρ', ὦ θεοδμάτα, λιπαροπλοκάμου
 παίδεσσι Λατοῦς ἡμεροέστατον ἔρνος,
³πόντου θύγατερ, χθονὸς εὐρεί-
 ας ἀκίνητον τέρας, ἄν τε βροτοί
 Δᾶλον κικλήσκουσιν, μάκαρες δ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
 τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον.

5

I. Theophr. *phys. opin.* *fr.* 12 (Doxogr. p.487 Diels) ap. Ps.- Philon. *π. ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου* 23 (6, 109 C.-W.) Πίνδαρος ἐπὶ τῆς Δήλου φησί· χαῖρ' ὦ — ἄστρον;
 II. Aristid. 43(1), 2,342,1 K.

Pindar here alludes to the fact that Delos was sometimes called Asteria. In line 5 he quotes the two names for the island. One used by mortals (Δᾶλος) and a separate one used by deity: τηλέφαντον κυανέας χθονὸς ἄστρον.⁵⁵ The shining rock of Delos in the dark blue is likened in Pindar's text to a star in the sky. This image is familiar to the poet who on more than one occasions says that an island is a gleaming star (*e.g.* in *Pae.* VI.126 calls the island of Aegina a star).⁵⁶ I find very fascinating the suggestion put forward by Snell that: "*When those in heaven look down upon the earth, our earth, particularly the sea, becomes their sky, and Delos flashes up as their brightest star.*"⁵⁷

Aristides' «diction» (λέξις) and «expression» (φράσις) recall the Pindaric «high style» (ὕψος). The «imitation» (ζήλωσις) of Pindar's style is aimed at:

1. use of Pindar's words, either identical (ἄστρον), or in similar form (πόντου), and
2. he reflects Pindar's striking image in establishing an analogy between 'stars' and 'islands'.

⁵⁴. Turyn regards the remarkable length of the fourth verse (33 syllables) as an argument against taking 33c and d to be from the same hymn as 29 & 30. He prints the fragment under the general category *ἀδηλα*, whereas Bowra takes it as *προσόδιον*.

⁵⁵. On this Kirkwood (1982: 305), argues that: "*for the gods to call Delos 'star of the dark-hued earth' is an intriguing paradox*".

⁵⁶. *Fr.* 52f. [ὦ] Διὸς Ἑλλανίου φαεινὸν ἄστρον.

⁵⁷. Snell 1953: 81.

Therefore, the presence of that vocabulary should not be considered as haphazard, but Aristides may have had in mind the invocation of Delos in the Pindaric *hymn to Zeus*. He also echoes Pindar's image on other occasions. In his *Or.* XLIV *εἰς τὸ Αἰγαῖον πέλαγος*, in a passage very similar to the *Or.* XLIII, he says about the Aegean Sea:

εἰκότως. τὰ μὲν γὰρ κατ' ἡπειρον πάντα καὶ ἐνταῦθα | ἔστιν ἐν ταῖς
ἐν μέσῳ χώραις, τὸ δὲ τούτου κάλλος ἐκείναις οὐ | πρόσεστιν· ὥσπερ δὲ
οὐρανὸς τοῖς ἄστροις κεκόσμηται, οὕτω καὶ | τὸ τοῦ Αἰγαίου πέλα- 5
15 γος ταῖς νήσοις κεκόσμηται.

(*Aristid.* 44 (17) 2,350,23-4K).

It is perfectly reasonable to assume that when Aristides had read the hymn he appreciated the subtle image that Pindar introduced through the mouth of the Gods of Delos being compared to a “*far shining star*”. This striking expression may have conditioned to some extent Aristides' conception of νῆσοι in the sea resembling ἄστρα in the sky. Snell arguing in favour of this possibility remarks “*Dabei schwebt ihm wohl der Anruf an Delos aus dem Zeus-hymnos vor. Ähnlich auch or. 44 §14... (p.350K)*”.⁵⁸ We should also notice that we do not possess evidence in the whole of Greek literature in which someone else attempted this kind of analogy of stars resembling islands, apart from Pindar and Aristides who both are fond of using this particular image elsewhere in their works.⁵⁹

Aristides in both prose-hymns, (*Ors.* XLIII, XLIV), reflects the Pindaric image which in the new context is subjected to a reinterpretation and acquires a broader sense and a completely new dimension. The Pindaric description of Delos looks transmuted in its component elements and it loses to some extent its original nuance.

We can point out the following changes in Aristides' treatment of that vivid Pindaric metaphor:

⁵⁸. Snell 1975: n.15.

⁵⁹. In Christian authors we find only the image of the sky decorated with stars: cf. Athenagoras *Apol. legatio* 13, 2; Josephus *AJ* 1, 31; Eus. *commentarius in Isaiam* 2, 28.

a. Aristides applies Pindar's words to include all the islands (including the Aegean islands) and at this point departs from the original text of Pindar who meant only the island of Delos.

b. In Pindar's text the island of Delos is called "*radiant star*" by all the gods, whereas in Aristides' *Or.* XLIII this expression is presented as a part of the praise for the creation of the universe for which Zeus is responsible. "*Zeus has decorated the sky with stars as he has also decorated the sea with islands*".

c. The island of Delos in Pindar's hymn is called τηλέφαντον ἄστρον. Aristides draws on this expression making a pun on it. In his hymn εἰς Δία the god "adorns the whole heaven with stars, as the sea is adorned with islands". On the other hand in his *Or.* XLIV, he reverses the order of the compared items.

The spirited encomium of the splendours of Delos and its striking and novel description, made the Pindaric hymn an appropriate source for Aristides upon which he drew for the embellishment of his prose-hymn to Zeus.

II.1.1 Aristid. 38(7), 2, 315-6, 26K = Pind. Fr. *33d.1-2.

In a speech delivered in August AD 147 for the sons of Asclepius at the temple of Asclepius in Pergamum, Aristides made an allusion to the same Pindaric hymn. The opening lines of the fragment printed under the number *33d are given in paraphrase and introduced with the known formula φασιν οἱ ποιηταί:⁶⁰

XXXVIII. (7) ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΑΙ.

12 Ἀπόλλω τε γάρ φασιν οἱ ποιηταί τὴν Δῆλον φερομένην | 26
 πρότερον στήσαι κατὰ τοῦ πελάγους ἐρείσαντα, ἐπειδὴ πρῶτον ἐν | 1
 αὐτῇ ἐγένετο, καὶ οὗτοι τῆς Μεροπίδος τότε ἐπιβάντες, προκρίναντες |
 ἀπασῶν εἶναι καλλίστην, ὅσαι παραπλήσιαι μέγεθος, ἴασαντό τε | καὶ
 ἀπέφηναν ἐμβατὸν πᾶσιν Ἑλλήσι καὶ βαρβάροις, πρότερον | σφαλερὰν καὶ 5
 ὑποπτον οὔσαν, καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν κυρίαν τῇ νήσῳ | κατέστησαν.

(Aristid. 38 (7) 2,315-6,26 K).

Pindar Fr. *33d

The myth reported that Delos, the island in the Aegean, after floating upon the sea without peace for many years, finally came to a halt with the birth of the two deities (Apollo, Artemis) by Leto.⁶¹ The whole Pindaric passage (10 lines), was preserved in the 10th book of Strabo. The metrical correspondence of fr.*33d to that of *33c and 29 suggests that this fragment is part of the same *hymn to Zeus*.

HYMNI FR. *33d = 88

<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ ?>

3 ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάροιθε φορητὰ
 κυμάτεσσιν παντοδαπῶν ἀνέμων
 ῥιπαῖσιν· ἀλλ' ἅ Κοιογενῆς ὀπότη' ὠδί-
 νεσσι θυίοισ' ἀγχιτόκοις ἐπέβα
 νιν, δὴ τότε τέσσαρες ὀρθαί 5
 πρέμνων ἀπώρουνσαν χθονίων,
 col. 2 6 ἄν' ἰδ' ἐπικράνοις σχέθον
 πέτραι ἰάδαμαντοπέδιλοι
 8 κίονες, ἐνιθα τεκοῖ-
 σ' εὐδαίμον' ἐπόψατο γένναν. 10
 .] . . ἰσ[

I. 1-10 Strab. 10, 5, 2 p.485 ἦν γὰρ τὸ π. φ., Δήλου φησὶν ὁ Πίνδαρος, - γένναν

II. 1-3 Favorin. π. φυγῆς col. 23,13 καὶ γὰρ ἡ σὴ ναῦς φθαρτὴ καὶ φορητὴ κύμασιν παντοδαπῶν ἀνέμων [ν] ῥιπαῖσι; Cf. Eustath. Od. 1644,53.

III. 1-3 schol. Od. 10, 3 περὶ τὴν Δῆλον ἱστορεῖ Πίνδαρος λέγων οὕτως· ἦν γὰρ - ῥιπαῖς.

IV. Aristid. 38 (7) 2,315-6,26 K. V. 7-11 PSI 14, 1931 (fr. 1 col. 2, 1-5).

⁶⁰ For this mode of citing cf. the discussion in introduction p.40, and *OL* 1.26ff., p.158.

⁶¹ Snell thinks these lines may be the proem of Muses' song within the *hymn*.

The lofty style of this section of the hymn makes Pindar's words a fitting embellishment for his prose-hymn.

The quotation is introduced as a *mythical exemplum* with which Aristides attempts to establish a link between the beneficial action of Apollo and that of Ἀσκληπιόδαι: in Pindar's hymn the island of Delos which had been a plaything of the waves and the winds finds its miraculous setting thanks to Apollo when he was being born in it; on the other hand in Aristides' oration the land of Meropes⁶² equally benefited when the sons of Asclepius set foot upon it. Thus, the fortunes of Delos and Cos are linked together.

The source for the Pindaric 'hymn to Zeus'

The quotations from Pindar's hymn in Aristides seem to be of independent tradition probably coming from his own readings of the hymn which he may have mastered at some time in his youth. A comparative examination of his quotations suggests that the orator may have had a personal knowledge of what Pindar treated in this lost hymn. This is my conclusion for the following reasons:

1. The leading position in the edition of Pindar brought out by the Alexandrian grammarians was taken by the hymns. The place of honour was granted to the *hymn to Zeus*. Therefore, the particular place that the hymn had in introducing the first book of Pindar's works, made it famous among the poems about the gods since everyone knew it like the poems in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. So we can suppose that this hymn was one of the first works of Pindar that Aristides studied in his readings of Greek poetry.

In the age of Aristides Pindar's poems εἰς θεούς were in circulation. The *hymn to Zeus* must have been included in his text of Pindar that he used since he writes before the time of the selection that happened to the works of Pindar.⁶³

2. Aristides holds an important place among the Imperial age authors contributing much to our knowledge of the whole hymn. His testimonies indicate that the orator used the Pindaric hymn itself as a source for his quotations rather than any other text such as

⁶². Meropes were called the inhabitants of the island of Cos after Μέροψ, father of the king Eumelus; cf. **Smith** s.v. Merops (1).

⁶³. Cf. **Irigoin** 1952: 93-100. Cf. also the discussion earlier in p.69.

for instance that of Plutarch (especially for *fr.* 32). The subject matter of *frs.* 32, *33, 33c, *33d, *31, and *35a, and the corresponding contexts of Aristides, suggest that all these are derived not from a specific section of the hymn but that they come from various places in the hymn, which Aristides quoted at various points in his speeches. His quotations show that he had an adequate and independent knowledge of the hymn, which can give us an insight into some of its major motifs. *Fr.* 32 probably stood before the mythological account with which Apollo and the Muses regaled the wedding guests, whereas *frs.* *31 and *35a might come after the various weddings of Zeus where Apollo may have celebrated the creation of order and harmony by Zeus.

3. The *grammatici* used to consider the *περίληψις* (summary) and *παράφρασις* (paraphrase) of the classical texts of both poetry and prose, as absolutely necessary for rhetorical exercises. The same practice is therefore probable for the first Pindaric hymn for educational and rhetorical purposes. Pindar was one of the «ἐγκριθέντες» of every literary genre.

In the extant Byzantine scholia we possess traces of a paraphrase which Aristarchos prepared, and this was probably part of his commentary.⁶⁴ Other Hellenistic scholars also engage themselves with this task (e.g. Χρύσιππος ἀποδέδωκεν ὅτι...: schol. *Isth.* IV.25a). This favours the assumption that these paraphrases circulated in the Imperial age or that new ones were produced following this tradition.⁶⁵

Given the number of Aristides' paraphrases from the *hymn to Zeus*, it is likely that he used a whole paraphrase of Pindar's hymn.⁶⁶

Aristides refers to the hymn six times and in *frs.* 32 and *35a we have some original words quoted. If Aristides used a paraphrase, we can suppose that original words of the poem were contained in it. Aristides probably found it easier to use these paraphrases instead of the original text. So, the paraphrases he gives in *Ors.* II; III; XXXVIII and at the peroration of *Or.* XLIII may be shorter parts of complete paraphrases he may have made during his rhetorical studies.

⁶⁴ Cf. Irigoin 1952: 55-6, cf. schol. *Ol.* VIII.5b; *Nem.* I.34b.

⁶⁵ Cf. Irigoin 1952: 104. Lehrs (1873: 25-32, 120-58), succeeded in assembling parts of two paraphrases from *Ol.* IX and *Pyth.* IV.

⁶⁶ Cf. also the arguments earlier in the discussion of the source for *fr.* *31.

Finally, it should be noticed that Aristides shows a specific preference for quoting in the form of paraphrase rather than the actual words of Pindar, when myths and mythological *exempla* are at issue.

Aristides follows the same practice in citing in paraphrase quotations that are taken from the mythical sections of the *Ἐπίνικοι*.⁶⁷

⁶⁷. *Fr.*99* seems to be a similar case. The references to the accidental killing of Eurytion and Adrastus in *Or. III.37* should be better understood as passing references rather than paraphrases.

II.1.2 Aristid. 37(2), 2, 305, 22-3K = Pind. Fr. 146.

Introduction to *Or. XXXVII (2) ΑΘΗΝΑ*

Aristides venerated Athena as an important healing goddess,¹ especially at the time of Cathedra, for whom he wrote two speeches.² The second one, a prose-hymn, was delivered in January AD 153,³ at the instigation of a dream on his Baris-estate (on the east bank of the Aesepus).⁴

In this speech appear Athena's providence, her relations with healing and Asclepius, and her role as a joint participator with many other gods.⁵

The speeches XXXVII-XLI K, together with the fragmentary *Water of Pergamum* (LIII), were among those known by the time of the rhetor Menander as *Μαντευτοί*, “speeches commanded by a prophecy”.⁶

Aristides' context

The rhetorical technique of this prose-hymn to Athena follows the traditional structure in the development of the main section of the hymn, (birth, the god's power-benefits, relation with other gods, epithets). The tone is stilted. We have short cola, simple non-periodic structures, asyndeton and a distinctly grandiose use of vocabulary and quotations from poetry and Plato (*Timaeus*).

The section §§2-7 is dedicated to the birth of the goddess, which is presented as noteworthy (§2). She is the only legitimate child of Zeus.⁷

The miraculous birth of Athena is illustrated in the next paragraph: “she was born by Zeus alone, from the fissure of his head. She arose directly in full armour, like the sun rising with its rays” (§3).

¹. Behr 1968a: 153-4.

². The first speech is no more extant, and its existence is recorded in *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).39. This is also mentioned at *ib.* 25 and had precipitated *Or. XXVIII*.

³. For the date see Jöhrens 1981: 5-8; Swain 1996: 265 with n.47.

⁴. Keil in a note on *Or. XXVIII*.18 (p.147, l.10 of his *editio*), connected the lost boastful speech [*Athena*] with the present oration (*Or. XXXVII*), for which we know from its subscription that was written ἐπὶ σευήρου ἡγεμόνοσ' ἐτῶν ὑπάρχοντοσ' λεῖ καὶ μηνόσ' Α, ...

⁵. Behr (1968a: 153), notes that *Or. XXXVII* is cast in the form of an aretology.

⁶. *Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, 344.2. The title occurs in Mss of *Or. XXXVII* and was evidently a title of a collection of speeches.

⁷. Amann 1931: 14-23; Weinreich 1914: 602; Behr 1968a: 154.

(*Aristid.* 37 (2) 2,305,22-23 K).

Homer

9. **Jöhrens** 1981: *ad loc.* observes that the adjective 'Ομηρικός in Aristides is used for both people and objects, but here is used for reference to the Homeric scene. **Kindstrand** (1973: 100), notes that Aristides compared to Dio of Prusa and Maximus of Tyre uses more often the adjective 'Ομηρικός, which means something personal for him.

weapons of her father. Alluding to *Od.* 4.742 Ζηνὸς αὐλή (“the court of Zeus”), he claims that Zeus and the goddess use the same weapons as if on the “magicians” stage.

The second quote comes from the scene of Theomachy described in *Il.* 21.385-513, from where *l.* 401 is quoted verbatim, describing Athena as “*dread, which not even Zeus' thunderbolt masters*”. Aristides alludes to the superiority of Athena's “wisdom” over Zeus' “fierceness” and “violence”, in remarking that “*what pertains to Athena is more valuable to Zeus than his lighting and thunderbolts*”.¹⁰

Pindar Fr. 146

The quotation from Pindar is foreshadowed at paragraphs (4-5), where the divinity concerned is being exalted as far as possible at the expense of other gods. Athena receives special attention for her role as a close associate to Zeus. She is συμπεφυκυῖα with Zeus, always being by his side. In the division of the world made by Zeus, Athena is his assessor and adviser.

The same image of the goddess is reflected in his quotation from Pindar, which exemplifies Aristides' conception of her place between Zeus and the other gods. Athena is described as seated δεξιὰν κατὰ χεῖρα τοῦ πατρὸς ‘at her father's right hand’, presumably indicating a position of the highest honour.

If the interpretation of Aristides is accepted (7), τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῖς θεοῖς ἀποδέχεσθαι has to mean that Athena was delegated by Zeus with special authority in acting as intermediate between Zeus and the other Gods. Pindar's words are explicated at the next paragraph (7), where we are told that she is not only a messenger but she is delegated to interpret Zeus' commands for the gods.

FR. 146 (112).

Ἀθηνᾶ
πῦρ πνέοντος ἄτε κεραυνοῦ
ἄγχιστα δεξιὰν κατὰ χεῖρα πατρός
ἡμένην τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῖς θεοῖς ἀποδέχεται.

I. schol. T. Hom. Ω 100 (*de Minerva*)

II. Plut. *quaest. conviv.* 1, 2, 4 p.617C

III. Aristid. 37(2) 2, 305, 22-23 K.

¹⁰. See Jöhrens 1981: *ad loc.*

The Teubner editors following Keil correctly attribute the phrase τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῖς θεοῖς ἀποδέχεσθαι to Pindar, since the ensuing lines are Aristides' interpretation of these words. Aristides' intention is to indicate Athena's place in the hierarchy among the Olympians, which is for him the best compliment to the goddess.¹¹

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 146

The extant text of *fr.* 146 was retrieved from quotations of Imperial Age authors and commentators, who could go back to Hellenistic times. They cite various portions of the text and provide a different word-order and readings:

Schol. T. Hom. <i>Ω</i> 100b 1	Plut. <i>qu. conv.</i> 1, 2, 4 p.617C	Aristid. 37(2) 2, 305,22-23K.
παρ Διὶ πατρί· ἐκ δεξιῶν, ὥς φησι Πίνδαρος, 'πῦρ πνέοντος ἅ τε κεραυνοῦ ἄγχιστα δεξιὰν κατὰ χεῖρα πατρός ἴζεαι·' καὶ ἐν τῷ Καπετωλίῳ δὲ οὕτως ἴδρυται ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ. T	διαρρήδην δ' ὁ Πίνδαρος λέγει (<i>fr.</i> 146) 'πῦρ πνέοντος ἅ τε κεραυνοῦ ἄγχιστα ἡμένη·	Πίνδαρος δ' αὖ φησιν δεξιὰν κατὰ χεῖρα τοῦ πατρός αὐτὴν καθεζομένην τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῖς θεοῖς ἀποδέχεσθαι.

The quotation in Plutarch (*quaest. conviv.* 1, 2, 4 p.617C), seems to coincide in its first part with that in Homer's scholiast, and in this respect these two quotes are more closely related. On the other hand, Aristides' testimony stands independently sharing with the scholiast the phrase δεξιὰν κατὰ χεῖρα [τοῦ] πατρός, and with Plutarch only the participle ἡμένη, which Aristides paraphrases in καθεζομένην.¹² All three authors ascribe the lines to Pindar and explicitly connect them with Athena, without however specifying the literary genre of the quotation.

The scholiast seems to have known a fuller text, since his quotation contains both portions that are quoted by Aristides and Plutarch. Plutarch quotes *fr.* 146 among a series of quotations, mainly from Homer, illustrating instances where a god is being awarded a prominent place next to Zeus (cf. Poseidon *Il.* 20.15; Thetis 24.100). It seems certain that Aristides does not cite Pindar from Plutarch's *quaest. conviv.*, since both authors cite

¹¹ Pindar's words seem to have been modelled upon *Il.* 24.100 ἢ δ' ἄρα παρ Διὶ πατρὶ καθέζετο, εἶξε δ' Ἀθήνη. Jöhrens 1981: *ad loc.*, propounds that line 29 of Call. *hymn Ap.* was modelled upon Pindar (δύναται γάρ, ἐπεὶ Διὶ δεξιὸς ἦσται).

¹² ἔξεται? Bgk 1866,1878 ἡμένα? Schr. 1900.

different portions of the extant *fr.* 146. Aristides, in particular, quotes a comparatively additional phrase from τὰς ἐντολάς down to ἀποδέχεσθαι.

Therefore, Aristides' source for *fr.* 146 may have included more text, and he appears also to be selective in omitting the first line of the extant fragment, which is partially overlapped by his second quotation from Homer (*Il.* 21.401).

The quotation in Plutarch suggests the possibility that he quoted Pindar either from the Homeric scholia or the text of an anthology, and not from an original edition of Pindar. In Plutarch's text, the interlacing of quotations from various poets on the same topic, (*i.e.* the honorary post given to certain gods next to Zeus), may suggest that Plutarch quarried his Pindaric and Homeric quotations from an anthological collection listing examples of gods favoured with such a prestigious distinction. This seems also possible since the connection of the Pindaric quotation with Plutarch's argument is not firmly established but is cited as a part of a series of related quotations. Alternatively, Plutarch may have quoted *fr.* 146 from a Homeric *ὑπόμνημα*.¹³

The above testimony of Plutarch and that of the scholia make plausible the assumption that the original poem was already lost by the time of the second sophistic movement and only *fr.* 146 was excerpted in an anthology, in which the quoted lines were explicitly connected with the goddess Athena with, however, no information about the genre of the song being recorded. It is along this line of tradition that we must consider the quotation cited by Aristides, who may have collected these lines along with others compiling a list of striking poetic expressions for his prose-hymns to various gods.

¹³. Plutarch like Aristides seems to have used ancient commentaries for certain quotations. Cf. the discussion on pp.195-6 for a good example of Plutarch's use of an *ὑπόμνημα* on Pindar.

II.1.3 Aristid. 39(18), 2, 324, 1K = Pind. Ol. VII. 7.

Introduction to *Or. XXXIX* (18) *ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΦΡΕΑΡ ΤΟ ΕΝ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΥ*

This little speech was composed during Aristides' stay in Pergamum in January, AD 167,¹ and it was inspired by the dream recorded in *Hieros Logos* I (47). 42. Aristides had often used this sacred Well during his therapy and in this speech praises the curative powers of its waters.²

Aristides' context

Aristides having spoken about the quality of Asclepius' water, in the section §§12-7 dwells on the benefits it offers to its pilgrims. The Well has assisted many people in aiding and curing various illnesses, and in obtaining from the god what they desired. It is meant to be used by both the sick and those in health, and it proves equally to be the most pleasant and the most useful. It stands far beyond any comparison to “milk” and “wine”. The superiority and uniqueness of this water is illustrated with a quotation from Pindar's *Ol. VII.7*, which is introduced in a form of a paraphrase:

XXXIX. (18) *ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΦΡΕΑΡ ΤΟ ΕΝ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΥ.*

καὶ τοῖς τε δὴ νοσοῦσιν οὕτως ἀλεξιφάρμακον καὶ σωτήριόν ἐστιν | καὶ τοῖς 25
 ὑγιαίνουσιν ἐνδαιτωμένοις παντὸς ἄλλου χρῆσιν ὕδατος | οὐκ ἄμεμπτον
 16 ποιεῖ. πάντα γὰρ ἤδη μετὰ τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ γίγνεται πειρωμένοις, οἷον εἴ
 τις μετὰ ἀνθοσμῖαν οἶνον τῶν ἐξεστη|κότων τινὰ πίνῃ. μόνον δὲ τοῦτο τὸ
 αὐτὸ νοσοῦσι καὶ ὑγιαίνουσιν | ὁμοίως ἡδιστον καὶ λυσιτελέστατον ἑκατέρῳ
 τε καὶ συναμφοτέροις | ἐστίν, καὶ οὐτ' ἂν γάλα παραβάλοις οὐτ' ἂν οἶνον 30
 ποθήσῃς. ἀλλ' | ἐστὶν ὥσπερ Πίνδαρος (Ο. VII 7) τὸ νέκταρ ἐποίησεν 1
 αὐτόχυτον, | πότιμον θεῖα τινὶ κράσει κεκραμένον ἀρκούντως. ὥστε εἰ δύο |
 εἶεν κύλικες, ἢ μὲν ἑτέρου τοῦ ὕδατος, καὶ οἶνου τοῦ καλλίστου, | ἢ δὲ τούτου
 17 τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀπορήσῃς ἂν πότερον λάβοις. ἔτι δὲ | τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἱερὰ ὕδατα 5
 τῇν τῶν πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων χρῆσιν πέ|φευγεν, οἷον τὸ ἐπὶ Δήλῳ καὶ εἴ τί
 που ἄλλοθι ἄλλο τοιοῦτόν | ἐστὶ, τὸ δὲ τῷ σῶζειν τοὺς χρωμένους, οὐ τῷ
 μηδένα αὐτοῦ ψάσειν, | ἱερόν ἐστιν· καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καθαρσίῳς τε ἐξαρκεῖ τοῖς
 περὶ τὸ ἱερόν | καὶ ἀνθρώποις καὶ πίνειν καὶ λούεσθαι καὶ προσορῶσιν
 εὐφραί|νεσθαι.

10

(*Aristid. 39 (18) 2,323-24,1 K*).

¹ **Boulanger** (1923: 134, 161), dates it between AD 146-153.

² **Behr** 1968a: 29, 105, 156. The speech was probably included in the *μαντευτοί*.

Aristides here probably thought that Pindar described νέκταρ as a satisfactory blended divine mixture, whose main attributes were: “*potable*”, and “*αυτόχυτον*” (:originating in itself / self-pouring).³

Pindar *Ol.* VII. 7

Pindar has a predilection for comparing the poem to a sweet drink. In *Ol.* VII.7 he calls the poem that he offers to Diagoras νέκταρ χυτόν in the sense ‘poured out’.⁴

OLYMPIA VII (464)

— καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν, Μοισᾶν δόσιν, ἀεθλοφόροις
ἀνδράσιν πέμπων, γλυκύν καρπὸν φρενός,
³ ἰλάσκομαι,
Ὀλυμπία Πυθοῖ τε νικῶν-
τεσσιν·

IO

(*Ol.* VII.7-10).

The text itself does not present any problem in its transmission. The four opening lines of the ode were appreciated and quoted extensively by ancient authors⁵ and it seems quite probable that these lines might have been included in an anthology, whereas *l.* 7 (:νέκταρ χυτόν) is cited only by Aristides. The word αυτόχυτον is not to be considered as a variant reading introduced by Aristides himself. The corresponding scholion on Pindar makes clear that the word is a gloss:

BCDEQ 12a. καὶ ἐγὼ νέκταρ χυτόν: αυτόχυτον καὶ ἄκρατον. 1^bBCDEQ 15
BCDE b. νέκταρ τὸ ποίημα εἶπε· Μοισᾶν δὲ δόσιν, τὴν μουσικὴν καὶ τοὺς ὕμνους.
(schol.*Ol.* VII.12a. Dind.)

The ancient scholiast took the phrase to denote τὸ αυτόχυτον καὶ ἄκρατον, but this view has been rejected by some modern critics.⁶

³. The word in Aristides' context could also indicate that is ready to drink coming directly from its source.

⁴. Cf. Willcock 1995: *ad loc.* I consider necessary to quote here Verdenius' comment (1987: *ad loc.* χυτόν), who although he agrees with Dissen 1830 (: “*fusum, infusum, tamquam vinum in phialam*”), does not mention him: “Not ‘liquid’ (LSJ, Gild., [Boeckh ‘*fluidum*’] *et al.*), for this meaning is post-classical, nor ‘limpide’ (Puech, Galiano), but ‘poured out’,... it has been carefully prepared before it could be ‘served’. Cf. *O.* 6,91 κρατὴρ ἀοιδᾶν, *I.* 5, 25 κίρνάμεν, 6, 2-3 κρατῆρα Μοισαίων μελέων | κίρναμεν. These parallels show that the schol. αυτόμάτον* καὶ ἄκρατον is completely wrong”. *[a printing mistake for αυτόχυτον].

⁵. *ll.* 1-4 Athen. 11,111 p.503F; *l.* 2 Syrian. in Hermog. 1,41,9 Rabe; *l.* 4 Iulian. *epist.* 4,428b p.8 B-C.

⁶. Verdenius, see above n.4. I think that Verdenius errs in arguing that the scholia are “completely wrong”. In the parallels (*Isth.* V.25; VI.2-3) he quotes to support such a view, the *nomen agentis* is the poet who prepares a mixture of songs to praise the victor. On the other hand it is a common assumption that the νέκταρ is prepared only by a divinity and this sense is in line with the following Μοισᾶν δόσιν. The scholiast may have thought that the νέκταρ flowed out by itself (‘self-flowing’: LSJ s.v. αυτόχυτον), making clear that no mixture was involved (ἄκρατον).

Therefore, it seems almost certain that Aristides in his quotation of *Ol.* VII.7 relied on scholia and under their influence he interpreted the word in the same sense. Confirmation for the above hypothesis comes from §7, where Aristides dwelling on the quality of Asclepius' water, recalls certain remarks that are recorded in the same scholion.⁷

The particular source of that water made it very distinct and it is qualified as the most delicate, most light and gentle, and as most sweet and potable, “*originating in itself*”. The superb quality is stated explicitly “*if you drink it, you would not want wine besides*”.⁸ Aristides may here have in mind Pindar's *χυτόν*, and he probably drew on the corresponding scholion:

Schol. <i>Ol.</i> VII.12e. Dind.	Aristid. 39(18), 2, 321, 15-6K
12e. ν έ κ τ α ρ χ υ τ ό ν: καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν τῶν Μουσῶν δόσιν, ἥτις ἐστὶ νέκταρ χυτόν καὶ αὐτὸ ἄκρατον· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιδέεται τοῦτο συγκράσεως, ὥσπερ οἶνος χωρὶς ὕδατος· 8 A	§ 7 πρῶτον μὲν γε λεπτότατον ἐγγυτάτω ἄερος, ἔπειτα ὁ τούτῳ ἔπεται, κουφότατόν τε καὶ πρατότατον, τρίτον γλυκύτατόν τε καὶ ποτιμώτατον, [αὐτόχυτον], ὁ πίνων οὐκ ἂν οἶνου προσδεθῇς.

Aristides may have taken his comparison between ‘water’ and ‘wine’ (ὁ πίνων οὐκ ἂν οἶνον προσδεθῇς), from the schol. Pind. *Ol.* VII.12e (οὐ γὰρ ἐπιδέεται τοῦτο συγκράσεως, ὥσπερ οἶνος χωρὶς ὕδατος).

The whole wording of §7 anticipates his quotation from Pindar further at §16. The epithets qualifying the god's water are given in groups each referring to the properties of the water (§7): λεπτότατον, κουφότατον, πρατότατον (:composition–texture), and γλυκύτατόν, ποτιμώτατον, [αὐτόχυτον] (: taste).

The antiquity of appearance of the *lectio* αὐτόχυτον in a Ms. close to ποτιμώτατον can be better explained as anticipatory error, under the influence of αὐτόχυτον, πότιμον further on, in §16.⁹

⁷. Cf. also Behr *Aristides* 1981: vol.II.413 n.15.

⁸. A similar idea is recorded in *Hieros Logos* 3 (49).31.

⁹. The gloss αὐτόχυτον is preserved in Ms. A (C 222). Although in cases where Aristides quotes from an ancient *ὑπόμνημα* his tradition seems to agree with that of the scholia preserved in A, it is rather difficult to conjecture that αὐτόχυτον got into the text of later Pindar scholia precisely from Aristides. The source for Aristides' αὐτόχυτον may be a Hellenistic *ὑπόμνημα*.

The sixth century epic poet Nonnus expresses similar ideas in his *Dionysiaca* employing αὐτόχυτος as qualifying 'νέκταρ', probably drawing on Aristides' quotation:

a. ὕδωρ (*D.* 42.97): Διόνυσος ὑποκλίνας γόνυ πηγῇ | κοιλαίνων παλάμας ἐρατὴν μιμήσατο κούρην, | νέκταρος αὐτοχύτοιο πίων γλυκερώτερον ὕδωρ.

b. νέκταρ (*D.* 7. 77): αὐτοχύτῳ γλυκὺν οἶνον ἐοικότα νέκταρι δώσω.¹⁰

Aristides, in attributing to the god's water what he thought Pindar meant by νέκταρ [αὐτό]χυτον, praises that water. However, the orator's real intention is to propound through his quotation, the superiority of Asclepius' water over all others. The scholia (*Ol.* VII.12b) assume that Pindar used νέκταρ as a symbol for his poetry and many scholars are still prepared to accept this explanation. Aristides, who appears to be familiar with the scholiasts' tradition does not follow their interpretation, but he twists the original meaning of the words. Pindar can use "νέκταρ" by metonymy for wine¹¹ but in *Ol.* VII.7 it is used as a symbol for poetry. On the other hand Aristides uses the word as an attribute for the temple's water indicating quality. The following sentence "θεῖα τινὶ κράσει κεκραμένον ἄρκούντως" creates in the context of the speech a religious overtone and is in tune with the religious colouring of Pindar's proem (cf. *l.* 7 Μοισᾶν δόσιν).¹² The νέκταρ is a drink for the gods, and when the water of the well is so called, it acquires a divine dimension. The ὕδωρ gains its importance not so much as a therapeutic means but as a medium causing gratification and a state of euphoria in the pilgrims' hearts. This feeling is in line with the χάρις of festivity that is echoed in the proem of *Ol.* VII.

The following image of the two κύλικες is not a mere picturesque addition, but forms an organic part of the whole comparison. The god's water is still superior over any other, even if it is blended with the fairest wine. The image might originate from Pindar's cup (φιάλαν *l.* 1), as it is presented in the opening line of *Ol.* VII. Aristides might have had

¹⁰. Cf. *D.* 14.435 αὐτόχυτον γὰρ | κείνο, τό περ καλέουσι Διὸς πόμα, νέκταρ Ὀλύμπου, and *D.* 25.443. The word αὐτόχυτος occurs twelve times in his *Dionysiaca* qualifying the 'αἶμα' (46, 311); 'ὕδωρ' (7, 147); 'δάκρυ' (6, 9); and 'γάλα' (24, 131). The word further occurs in *AP* IV.136 qualifying αἶμα; cf. also the doubtful sense α. θάλαμος in *Hes. fr.* 96.102.

¹¹. Cf. *Isth.* VI.37, *Parth.* II.76. See on that Willcock 1995: *ad loc.* For wine as a medium of inspiration see Crowther 1979: 1-11.

¹². See Verdenius 1987, (7: νέκταρ). A religious dimension to the preceding toast is seen by Brown 1984: 43.

in his mind the story told by Pindar about the wedding feast, where the father-in-law offers to the young bridegroom a cup of foaming wine. This image is employed by Aristides creatively attempting a free adaptation into his context. His objective is to coin a praise for the waters of the temple, which is perfectly achieved with this striking image of the two κύλικες.

Aristides found a relief for his despondent feelings when he was ordered by Asclepius to bathe in this well and drink from its water. Now he feels the need to express his gratitude by making a nice compliment for that water.

The source for Pind. *Olympian* VII in *Or.* XXXIX

The number of Aristides' quotations of and allusions to *Olympian Seven* shows that he may have a comprehensive knowledge of the ode, and it also suggests the possibility that this ode might have been studied from a fuller text of Pindar. (He quotes in paraphrase and alludes to different parts from the *second* and *third* myth of the ode in his *Ors.* XXIV and XXV).¹³

In the present speech (*Or.* XXXIX), Aristides appears also to have used other study materials such as an ancient commentary in his quotation of *Ol.* VII.7 (: he quotes the gloss αὐτόχυτον in §16). That use of the commentary is indicative of the possibility that *Ol.* VII was analysed in Alexander's commentary and was probably studied by Aristides at an earlier stage.

¹³. For a table indicative of Aristides' knowledge for *Ol.* VII, see p.270.

II.1.4 Aristid. 41(4), 2, 331, 17-9K = Pind. Fr. *99.

Introduction to Or. XLI (4) ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ.

This short hymn was inspired by a dream from Asclepius: the god Asclepius orders him to compose the hymn to Dionysus (*Hieros Logos* 4 [50].25), in an effort to reembark Aristides on his oratorical career.

One does not have to attribute the arousal of interest in Dionysus to the “emotional strain” Aristides ‘suffered’ during the time of Cathedra (AD 146-147), as Behr does.¹ In simpler and less controversial terms it appears fitting for Aristides to compose a hymn to a god whose domain of power relates to his specific circumstance and need. Aristides’ prose-hymn to Διόνυσος makes it after all evident that his sickness prompts him to address and praise the god; Uerschels explicitly interprets the hymn as an invocation to the healing power of the god, whom he addresses as Λύσιος.²

Date and place of the oration are uncertain. Boulanger and Behr suggest that the speech was delivered in the early part of Aristides’ incubation at the temple of Asclepius at Pergamum.³ It is in Pergamum actually that he could have found much of the material for the syncretistic link he makes between the names Zeus and Asclepius and Dionysus and Zeus (Or. XLII.4 συνάπτομεν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν), which allowed him to identify Dionysus with Zeus (§4).⁴ Yet, given the fact that the worship of Zeus-Bacchus implied in the oration was very familiar to the Pergamenes, it would have been improbable – according to Uerschels – for Aristides to have introduced the suggestion with the phrase “I have heard from some other people” (§4, ἤδη δέ τινων ἤκουσα καὶ ἕτερον λόγον ὑπὲρ τούτων...) while addressing the Pergamene audience. Uerschels thought of Smyrna, where Dionysus was important and the cult-name *Briseus* is attested.⁵ This reference was probably included as *captatio benevolentiae*.

Short the hymn to Dionysus may be, however it is quite representative of the tone and style of the genre, combining both a very symmetrical and meticulously crafted

1. Behr 1968a: 52.

2. Aristides refers to the god as λύτης πάντων (cf. Plut. *quaest. conviv.* 613C πάντων μὲν ὁ Διόνυσος Λύσιός ἐστι καὶ Λυαῖος). Although Διόνυσος was not in himself thought of in Greece as a healing god, healing powers were attributed to wine and there is abundant evidence in the tradition which acknowledges to the God a healing capacity via the ‘λυσιπῆμον’ virtue of the wine; cf. *Lg.* 772d.

3. Boulanger 1923: 161.

4. It is known through an inscription in Pergamum (*CIG* 3538), dating back to the times of Antoninus Pius and Caracalla, that there was in Pergamum a worship of Zeus-Bacchus. Aristides often relates gods’ names to make syncretistic transitions which enable identifications that entrench the status of the god he has embarked on praising. Cf. Uerschels 1962: 27, cf. “Ἡρακλῆς Ἀσκληπιέ (Or. XL.21), and Ζεὺς Σάραπις (Or. XLV.21).

5. Dionysus *Briseus* was worshipped at the foot of mountain Brisa, in Smyrna, and was pictured there as bearded, see more evidence in Uerschels 1962: 28-9, esp. 31-2.

rhetoical structure with a content whose argument is enriched with mythical elements deriving from Plato and Pindaric poetry, as well syncretistic elements from his personal experiences in his wide travels.⁶

XLI. (4) ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ.

4 ταῦτ' ἄρα καὶ ἄρρην τε καὶ θῆλυς ὁ θεός, ὥς | 10
 φασιν, ὅτι αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐκατέρας τῆς φύσεως μετέσχευ [εἰς | αὐτόν].
 ἤδη δέ τινων ἤκουσα καὶ ἕτερον λόγον ὑπὲρ τούτων ὅτι | αὐτὸς ὁ Ζεὺς εἶη ὁ
 5 Διόνυσος. καὶ τί ἂν εἴποις ὑπὲρ τοῦτο; ἔστι | δὲ τῇ φύσει καὶ τὴν μορφὴν
 προσεοικώς. ὥσπερ γὰρ δίδυμος | πάντῃ αὐτὸς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐστίν· καὶ γὰρ 15
 ἐν ἡθέοις καὶ ἐν κόραις, | καὶ αὖ ὥς ἐν ἄρρεσιν ἀγένειός τε καὶ Βρισεύς, καὶ
 6 πολεμικός τε | δὴ καὶ εἰρηναῖος διαφερόντως θεῶν. διδόασιν δ' αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν
 | Πᾶνα χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν ὄντα, ὥς Πίνδαρός τε ὕμνεϊ |
 (frg.99) καὶ οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἱερεῖς κατέμαθον, ...

(Aristid. 41 (4) 2,331,17-19 K).

Aristides' context

The first theme is the god's miraculous γένεσις (§3). Insofar as much of the god's unique status is entailed from the particular circumstances of his birth, this is a particularly important section, marked out more prominently than in other hymns.⁷

Second comes the theme of the special honour given by Zeus (§§3-4). Dionysus is deemed to be 'unique'⁸ (although in this precise sense, Athena could be said, and Aristides does say that she is unique in his hymn to the goddess, *Or.* XXXVII.2). Aristides dwells on the nature of the god, quoting scrupulously from myths attesting to the god's unique nature, thus exalting divine status:

(4) ταῦτ' ἄρα καὶ ἄρρην τε καὶ θῆλυς ὁ θεός, ὥς φασιν, ὅτι αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐκατέρας τῆς φύσεως μετέσχευ [εἰς αὐτόν].

I. the god, therefore, they say, is both “male” and “female”, because his father partook of both natures to bring him to birth.

⁶. Cf. Boulanger 1923: 311 (n.2), for the characteristics of Aristides' prose-hymns.

⁷. Aristides tells us (§3): “when Semele conceived, Zeus, wishing to be both to Dionysus -father and mother- sent Semele from earth to Olympus in fire and himself taking up his child stitched him up into his thigh and carried him ten months dwelling at first in Nysa beyond Ethiopia...”

⁸. Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 180a οἱ θεοὶ διαφερόντως αὐτὸν ἐτίμησαν.

The δίμορφος nature of the god combines opposite qualities: Dionysus is frequently represented both as an effeminate youth and also as an adult male. But also, in his masculine nature, he had a double manifestation, as beardless and as (bearded) Briseus.⁹ It must be noted that Aristides is here careful to attribute the claim to another (vague) authority. The same applies to the boldest of the claims regarding the grandeur and superior divine status of Dionysus, *i.e.* the claim (attributed to others) that:

2. *“Zeus and Dionysus are the same”*.

Aristides here proceeds to a syncretistic identification that elevates above any other praise the status and glory of the god praised (*“what greater could be said”?*). The syncretism is found in cult, but similar syncretistic identifications are also made about other gods. He is careful throughout, of course, not to express the identification (or other such identifications between deities) as a personal belief, but as a tradition of others. Such identifications are also claimed for Asclepius and Zeus¹⁰ and Sarapis and Zeus.¹¹ Multiple identifications facilitate a transition to the main identification aimed to extol the god praised in the hymn. The cults of other peoples in the East (*e.g.* Egyptians) offered plenty of material to allow such syncretistic identifications and it is from these that Aristides draws when he cites these syncretistic elements, while poetry (mainly Pindar) and Plato are the sources for his mythological elements. In the hymn to Dionysus however, we encounter one instance where the former comes in support of the latter, and the testimony of Egyptian priests is cited in order to strengthen Pindar's saying – or an interpretation of what Pindar is saying.¹²

He proceeds then to the next theme, that of the association of Dionysus with other gods and humans. Aristides dwells at some length on the topic, which makes the framework of the hymn down to §12. There are nine subdivisions here (§§6-12): relations with Pan, Hera, the Sileni, the Bacchae, Aphrodite, Ares, Athena and Hephaestus, the Eleusinian goddesses, the Nymphs and finally Eros, who is wholly dependent on

⁹. On this point Aristides has in mind the quite similar description of Dionysus offered by D.S. 4.5. The god Briseus Dionysus had a beard (Uerschels 1962: 31), and was associated with dance and music.

¹⁰. *Or.* XLII.4.

¹¹. *Or.* XLV.21.

¹². See exposition below.

Dionysus. These are taxing on Aristides' ability to avoid monotony, repetitions and predictability, and Aristides seems to be very conscious of this need.

Aristides' aim is to offer Dionysus the highest compliment, conforming to the demands laid before him by the divine agent. He may have thought that his praise to Dionysus' persona would be more efficient if he were to introduce into the god's company another divinity whose status was well established in ancient religious belief.¹³

(6) διδόασι δ' αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν ὄντα, ὡς Πίνδαρός τε ὕμνεϊ (frg.99) καὶ οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἱερεῖς κατέμαθον, ...

Dionysus is honoured by the Olympians with the god Pan (διδόασι δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα). Pan was traditionally associated with the *music* and *dance*, and this engagement is recorded in literature as the god's most favourite activities. (Cf. the god's epithets αἰπόλος καὶ χορευτῆς [Luc. *BisAcc.* 11];¹⁴ φιλόχορος [A. *Pers.* 448]; cf. also βρυάκτης and βαβάκτης [Hsch. β 10, 1226L.], εὔσκαρθμος [Agath. *AP* 6.32.2], σκιρτητής [Orph. *H.* 11.4 Q.], cf. also fr.*97 τὸ σὸν αὐτοῦ μέλος γλάξεις). He is also a fellow-dancer with the Nymphs and Satyrs, as an old Attic σκόλιον greets him, ὀρχηστά, Βρομίαις ὀπαδὲ Νύμφαις (887P).¹⁵

This attribute of the god makes him Dionysus' votary; but what adds real glamour and entrenches the reputation of the god is the fact that Pan is emphatically called “χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν ὄντα”. The authorship of the quoted extract is explicitly attested.

Pindar Fr.*99

The words quoted by Aristides bear the true Pindaric ring and must be *ipsa poetae verba*. The introductory phrase ὡς Πίνδαρός τε ὕμνεϊ indicates a verbatim quotation. All editors of Pindar, who have followed Boeckh in attributing to Aristides only a

¹³. Aristides has in mind Plato's suggestions about Dionysus. Plato expressed similar views about the god in *Lg.* 665a θεοὺς [Apollo, Muses, Dionysus]... συγχορευτὰς τε καὶ χορηγούς ἡμῖν δέδωκεναι; and 654 a: ἡμῖν... θεοὺς συγχορευτὰς δέδοσθαι. Cf. also Uerschels' reference (1962: 33) to Luc. *DDeor.* 22.3 [I Pan] ἡγοῦμαι αὐτῷ [sc. Διονύσῳ] τοῦ χοροῦ. See Lenz 1964: 214-5; Hug 1912: 55.

¹⁴. Cf. Ant. Lib. 22.3, 31.3-5. See also Roscher 1898: 70-1, *id.* 1897/1902: 1391-3; Herbig 1949: 24ff.

¹⁵. Cf. the Epid. *h.* Πᾶνα τὸν νυμφαγέταν. Ναῖδων μέλημ' αἰίδω, χρυσέων χορῶν ἀγαλμα; Alc. Mess. 20.5-6 *EG*, *AP* 9.142.1.

paraphrase, have attributed the whole construction of the phrase χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν to Pindar.¹⁶ *Fr.*99* is one of the very few fragments that survive from the poem in honour of Pan placed by the Alexandrians among the *κεχωρισμένα τῶν παρθενείων* (schol. Pind. *Pyth.* III.139a).¹⁷

Pind. FR. *99 (67) KECHORISMENA.

διδόασι δὲ αὐτῷ (scil. Διονύσῳ) καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν ὄντα, ὥς Πίνδαρος τε ὕμνεϊ καὶ οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἱερεῖς κατέμαθον.

Aristid. 41 (4) 2,331,18 K. (*sequitur fr.* 283).

It seems quite probable for Pindar to have spoken of the god in these terms, on the following grounds:

1. The citation of the god's name,¹⁸ his province,¹⁹ and his epithets are essential hymnal elements, which give to the whole hymn a sense of majesty and sumptuousness.²⁰ So, the elevation of Pan among the Ὀλύμπιοι (*fr.* 96.4), as a son of Apollo (*fr.* 100), and also to χορευτῆς τελεώτατος θεῶν, is the most fitting praise for the god, and is traditional in conception.²¹

2. The qualification attributed to the god stands in close relation with the other aspects of his image emphasised by Pindar in the other surviving fragments, cf. *fr.* 95.4-5, and *fr.*97*, and also as φύλαξ and ὁπαδός.²²

The passage raises tantalising problems of interpretation and has been subjected to a great amount of discussion. Whether Aristides' application of Pindar's words coincides with what the poet actually intended them to mean is not altogether certain. What is problematic about Aristides' quotation is not only the meaning of Pindar's praise of Pan – this is closely related to the construction of the quoted words, – but also the curious fact that

16. *Versus Pindaricos* χορευτὰν τελεώτατον | θεῶν *recuperabat* Schroeder. Exceptionally Snell prints Πᾶνα χορευτὴν τελεώτατον.

17. Uerschels (1962: 36), is wrong to assume that ὕμνεϊ indicates that the genre was a *hymn*.

18. Lehnus 1979: 111, 113.

19. *Ibid.* 113.

20. There is an hyperbole in Pindar's praise. For the hyperbolic style of the hymn cf. Keyssner 1932: 28ff.

21. The same idea is expressed by S. Aj. 695-8 ὦ Πᾶν Πᾶν... θεῶν χοροποι' ἄναξ. Cf. Werner 1967: 429. Cf. also Hom. *h. Pan.* 22-3.

22. Pindar's idea and beliefs about Pan are, according to Lehnus (1979: 122), consistent with the development of the figure of the god in vase paintings and the etymology of the god's name, cf. Brown 1977.

the local Egyptian priesthood are presented by the orator as consenting to the importance of the Greek god.

At this point a problem concerning the construction of *τελεώτατος* arises: does it go with *χορευτήν* or with *θεῶν*?

Two possible interpretations have been offered:

1. Pindar is not exalting Pan as the paramount divinity.²³ The supporters of this opinion translate: “most perfect²⁴ dancer of the gods”— *i.e.* supreme among the gods in dancing. According to this interpretation, the invocation of Pan as *χορευτῆς τελεώτατος* harmonises so well with the enthusiasm of the other surviving fragments of the hymn, that the version just given seems better than taking it to mean that Pindar sang of Pan as *τελεώτατος θεῶν*. The god's dance from the beginning of the hymn is foreshadowed to be a *Χαρίτων μέλημα* (*fr.* 95.5) and the aesthetic output is described as *τερπνόν*. The superlative *τελεώτατον*, suggests that the poet attached more importance to the aesthetic aspect of the god's dance. This obviously mean that Charites lend the appropriate charm to the dance of the gods.²⁵ The fact that Pan is praised as *χορευτῆς τελεώτατος*, does not cast a shadow over the supremacy of Dionysus. Lehnus arguing in favour of this claims that the element of *hyperbole* in Pindar's praise to the god, turns out to be “solitamente innocua”, and this comparison is mainly intended on hymnal grounds.²⁶

2. Every god can be considered as *τέλειος* in exercising his power.²⁷ On this assumption a number of scholars argue that it is probable for Pindar to have praised Pan as *τελεώτατος θεῶν*.²⁸ This interpretation has to be examined in the light of the Egyptian religious belief concerning the cult of Pan in Egypt.

The Greek god Pan is related to Hephaestus because both are connected with the arts but iconographically are different. In a parallel way the Egyptian god *Min* is identified with Pan by the Greeks because of his phallus.

23. In a similar fashion he treated Hestia as *πρώταν θεῶν* *Nem.* XI.6, Chronos *fr.* *33, cf. Poseidon *ὑψιστε θεῶν*. It is doubtful whether Pindar saw Pan as *τελεώτατος θεῶν*. For Lehnus (1979: 194-5), the element of hyperbole is innate in hymn (“insita nell' occasione e dizione innica”).

24. See Slater *s.v.* *τέλειος*, *τέλεος* b. Cf. the discussion in Uerschels 1962: 33 with n.119. It is also used from Pindar as an epithet for *Zeus* (*Ol.* XII.115, *Pyth.* I.67; *A. A.* 973 *Eu.* 28; Zeus in Pindar's poetry is beyond comparison with any other god; for god's epithets as *τέλειος κατ' ἐξοχήν*, Epitelleios, Telesphoros, see Lehnus 1979: 196 n.31), for *Hera* (*Nem.* X.18; *Ar.Th.* 973), for *Dike* (*A. A.* 1432), and for *Erinyes* (*A. Eu.* 381).

25. Lehnus (1979: 124), asserts that “μέλημα” and “τέρψις” belongs to erotic vocabulary.

26. *Ibid.* 191-2. Cf. *e.g.* Eur. *Phaëth.* 232 D. Κύπρι θεῶν καλλίστα.

27. *Ibid.* 195, with ns.28, 29.

28. Already Canter (in his *Index* reprinted in Dindorf 1964: vol.III.870), accepts this meaning: “*Deorum perfectissimus*”, cf. Bernand 1972: 10. Russell (1990a: 212 n.55), claims that Pan is ‘complete’ because he is ‘all’, τὸ πᾶν; quite likely to be right: Pindar likes puns. Cf. Cornutus 27 (p.49.4 Lang): Πᾶνα... τῷ παντὶ ὁ αὐτός ἐστι.

In saying οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἱερεῖς κατέμαθον, Aristides combines Pindar's views on the supremacy of Pan with those of the Egyptian priests, attempting a syncretistic identification of Pan with beliefs that he found in Egypt. The Egyptian priests are perhaps those of Hdt. 2.145, who believed Pan to be the oldest of gods. Aristides interprets Pindar's words quoting Egyptian Priests as agreeing with his interpretation.

Aristides in AD 141 set out on a tour of Egypt. In Egypt, with Alexandria as the base of his operations, he travelled extensively, proceeding as far south as the first cataract. Therefore, we can assume with Uerschels, that he had the opportunity to exchange ideas with the local priesthood.²⁹ There he was informed of the Egyptian beliefs about the power and reputation of Pan. The god Pan is evidenced as a powerful divinity in the Egyptian inscription CIG 4714: Πᾶν θεὸς μέγιστος; while Diodorus Siculus speaks of the exceptional cult of Pan in Egypt (1.18): τὸν Πᾶνα διαφερόντως ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων τιμώμενον.

Similar beliefs were held also for Egyptian gods. The god *Chemmis* is recorded in Roman inscriptions as μέγιστος and κύριος,³⁰ whereas the Egyptian god *Min* is qualified with the sacred title 'dancer'.³¹

Uerschels (*ad loc.*), speculates that the Egyptian priests did not refer to the Greek Pan but to an Egyptian goat-like god Μένδης as τελεώτατος θεῶν.³² This Egyptian Pan bore significant external similarities with the Greek Pan, being, like him, a goat-like god. Therefore we can assume that Aristides may have heard from the local priesthood an invocation to the corresponding "Pan", which he correlated to what Pindar said for the "Greek Pan".³³

Uerschels very ingeniously propounds the possibility that Pan τέλειος was an Egyptian belief that has been adopted by Pindar.³⁴ However, we can not accept such

²⁹ Uerschels 1962: 34, 36-7. Cf. *Or.* XXXVI.122 λέγω δὲ ἃ τῶν ἱερέων ἤκουον; *Ibid.* 1, 109.

³⁰ Lehnus 1979: 198 in n.41. Cf. Pan's epithet μέγας in Plut. *De def. orac.* 17 p.419C.

³¹ D.S. 1.18.2 records similar views for the god Min. Gauthier 1931a: 87, *id.* 1931b: 92-5, 113-4. Lehnus (1979: 192-3), suggests that the cult of the Egyptian gods: Mendes of Dêdet-Mendes and Anpet-Thmuis, of Ipu-Chemmis-Panopoli, are related with the dance. (Uerschels 1962: 33ff. For Egyptian dancer-gods see Mayassis 1957: 445, 449).

³² Cf. Hdt. 2.46 ὁ Πᾶν Αἰγυπτιστὶ Μένδης.

³³ Cf. Lehnus 1979: 194, "Aristide poteva accomunare poeta greco e sacerdoti locali".

³⁴ Uerschels 1962: 35.

speculation since there is no probability that Pindar ever visited Egypt. We should be also careful in attributing *fr.*201 to the hymn to Pan –as Uerschels did–, since the extant content is referring to an Egyptian rite totally foreign to Greek religious practice. Lehnus, also rejects Uerschels' view on metrical grounds.³⁵

Aristides very ingeniously bases his praise of Dionysus on a very subtle analogy involving the allocation of praise towards both divinities.

The invocation of Pan as χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν leads to a crescendo of the praise that Aristides bestows to Dionysus, without causing any disparity in the balance between both divinities. The supremacy of the god of wine is further emphasised by his having in his train a god, namely Pan, who occupied an important place in the Greek pantheon. This for Aristides does not seem to upset the equilibrium concerning the status of Dionysus in comparison to that of Pan. On this analogy the orator takes the opportunity to praise Pan as well, for whom at that time Aristides had some interest.³⁶ He quotes Pindar's words as a double compliment to Pan who is praised as an excellent dancer under the superiority of Dionysus. Aristides refers to the Egyptian priesthood, in order to give greater authority to Pindar's statement.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* *99 (*hymn to Pan*)

Aristides in all of his ten prose-hymns that he composed for divinities – (with the exception of *Or.* XL)–, employed Pindar's poetry. The poet's words formed an important part of the praise towards the honoured divinity. A quotation illustrating a feature of the god or an aspect of its myth was considered by Aristides as the most appropriate and fitting praise he could offer. It is noteworthy that the majority of the culled extracts are derived from the odes that Pindar dedicated to the gods. This specific preference of Aristides shows: **a.** the respect in which Pindar was held by Imperial Age's intelligentsia, and **b.** the appropriateness of quotes from Pindaric *hymns εἰς Θεούς* to Aristides' *hymns*.

³⁵ Lehnus 1979: 199.

³⁶ The incarnate spirit of animalism. However, Aristides' prudish character constrained him from any open expression of his feelings. Cf. Behr 1968a: 154-5. The god Asclepius orders him in a dream (*Hieros Logos* 4 (50).39), to compose not only for him but also indicated others as *Pan*, *Hecate* and *Achelous*.

From the indirect tradition of the text (*frs.* 95, *100, *96, *97, *98, and *99) it is clear that the content of the hymn was known – apart from Aristoteles and Aristides – also to:

1. the scholiast of *Pyth.* III.139a (*fr.* 95),
2. the biographer of *vit. Ambr.* p.2,5 (*fr.* 95),
3. the scholiast of Theocr. (*frs.* *97, *98, *100).

The above testimonies suggest the possibility that the whole hymn circulated in the first two centuries AD, especially among the commentators who used to find extra pleasure in illustrating parts of the poet's life especially when it concerned the relation with the god.

It is almost certain that Aristides had read the quoted lines as part of Pindar's *hymn to Pan* from which he quotes only *fr.* *99, and he is our solitary source. We may assume a renovation of Aristides' interest in Pindar's poetry following Asclepius' admonitions to reembark on his oratorical career, and also to study poetry in order to use it in his orations (*Hieros Logos* 4 (50).24).

Aristides may have compiled a list of certain striking quotations praising various gods from Pindar. The quote *χορευτὴν τελεώτατον θεῶν* could well have been classified under the entry '*Πανός*'.

We should not rule out the possibility that the *hymn to Pan* - like the *hymn to Zeus* - was paraphrased either by Aristides himself or by a grammatistes for educational purposes. Some of the original verses may have been included in the paraphrase, and it was likely for Aristides to quote Pindar's words from the text of a paraphrase rather than from the original merely for reasons of convenience.³⁷

³⁷. We possess a number of paraphrases that include verbatim quotations: 1. A wooden table that contains an accurate paraphrase of *Il.* 4.349-63, includes a number of the original words and expressions, e.g. *στήθεσσι; εἴ τι κακὸν νῦν εἴρηται*; cf. ed. by **Hombert-Préaux** 1951: 161-8 (II-III AD). 2. *Pack*² 2752: Collection of satirical sketches or "characters". P. Bad. 6.179; P. Heid. Siegmann 190 (250-210 BC). **Diehl** *ALG* (1942): 66-8, saw verses and ascribed the text to Sotades; **Lloyd-Jones** (1957: 426-7), suggests a rhetorical handbook such as was used by Pollux. 3. P. Berlin 21116 (Hermupolis), is a prose text which describes Achilles' shield. The writer cites verbatim *Il.* 18.483 and 485 leaving out *l.* 484 (cf. **Ioannidou** 1995). For other examples from school practice (esp. Homer), see **Ibrachim** 1972: 99 n.2.

II.1.4 Aristid. 41(4), 2, 331, 19-21K = Pind. Fr. 283?

The way that Dionysus is treated in this prose-hymn, shows that Aristides sticks to an encomium-scheme that he usually follows in praising gods. This involves three main themes:³⁸

1. The use of common opinions of men, who have many different concepts of and names for the god in their worship (*i.e.* §§4-5: *male-female*, identification of *Zeus-Dionysus*).

2. The universal worship of the god is the best praise (*i.e.* §6: *Pan – Egyptian priests*).

3. The enumeration of god's power, achievements, and his province. Over which τέχνηαι he presides (*i.e.* §§6-8: *'dancer', 'complete of the gods', 'healing power'*).

Aristides' context

Aristides through a series of associations of the god with other divinities and humans, aims to illustrate the immense amount of power that Dionysus possesses on every aspect. The next association that Aristides attempts, concerns the goddess Hera and her son Hephaestus (§6).

XLI. (4) ΔΙΟΝΥΣΟΣ.

...καὶ μὴν καὶ |

τὴν Ἥραν λέγουσιν ὡς μόνος θεῶν τῷ υἱεῖ διήλλαξεν κομίσας τὸν | 20

7 Ἥφαιστον ἄκοντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ταῦτά γε ἀναθεὶς ὄνῳ. καὶ |

ὡς μὲν αἰνιγμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ δῆλον, δῆλον δὲ καὶ οἱ τελευτᾷ | τὸ

αἰνιγμα, ὡς ἄρα πολλή τις καὶ ἄμαχος ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ | καὶ δύναται ἄν

καὶ ὄνους πτεροῦν, οὐχ ἵππους μόνον· ὥσπερ καὶ | λεόντων γάλα ἀμέλγειν 25

ἀνέθηκέν τις αὐτῷ Λακωνικὸς ποιητής· καὶ οὐδὲν ἄρα οὕτως βεβαίως

δεδήσεται, οὐ νόσῳ, οὐκ ὀργῇ, οὐ | τύχῃ οὐδεμιᾷ, ὃ μὴ οἶόν τ' ἔσται λῦσαι 1

τῷ Διονύσῳ. ἀλλὰ καὶ συμπότης | ὁ τέως πολέμιος, καὶ ὁ γέρων ἀνηβήσει,

καὶ πίεται κινουῦντος | τοῦ θεοῦ.

(Aristid. 41 (4) 2,331-2,19-21 K).

Aristides, claiming anonymous authority for his sources,³⁹ refers to a myth known from Paus. 1. 20, 3. (cf. *id.* 3.17,3; 18,9; Lib.VII, p.38 Foerster), where Dionysus

³⁸. Aristides' themes appear already in the instructions given by Quintilian and Alexander Numenius, cf. Russell 1990a: 208.

³⁹. This practice goes back to Plato's *Men.* 81a; *Grg.* 493a "I have heard..."; cf. Alc.42PMG ὡς λόγος.

is further praised for his services towards Hera. He alone of the gods reconciled Hera to her son Hephaestus, bringing him unwillingly up to the heaven and at that having placed him on the back of an ass.

Pindar Fr. 283?

From the tradition of the lexicographers (Photius, Suda) we are informed that Pindar had indeed treated the Hera-Hephaestus episode. The information is transmitted in the form of paraphrase (*fr.*283) and seems to have a very tenuous relation to Aristides' testimony.

FR. 283 (141).

(Ἥρα) παρὰ Πινδάρῳ ... ὑπὸ Ἥφαιστου δεσμεύεται ἐν τῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κατασκευασθέντι θρόνῳ.

I. Boethus *ad Plat. rep.* 2, 378 D *ap. Phot. lex.* 74, 1;

II. Sud. 2, 585, 1 Adl.;

III. Aristid. 41 (4) 2,331, 20-1 K. (*post fr.* *99).

The story goes back much further but the relevant testimonies date from later stages. Hera threw Hephaestus out of Olympus because of his physical deficiency. Hephaestus revenged himself on Hera by ensnaring her in an ingeniously constructed throne where she had to remain until Dionysus, having made him drunk, brought him back to Olympus.⁴⁰ From the paraphrase of the Pindaric fragment it is clear that Pindar follows this version of the myth, which became a favourite subject for Attic vase-painters in 6th cent. BC.⁴¹

Aristides forms the unique literary testimony of the specific episode of Hephaestus' return on an ass.⁴² However, he omits the detail that Dionysus made Hephaestus drunk in order to bring him home. The absence of other sources made Uerschels assume that Aristides probably refers to Pindar's poem, where the ensnaring of Hera and the return of Hephaestus formed its content.⁴³

⁴⁰. Preller-Roberts 1887-1926: I.177.

⁴¹. The vases are collected and commented on by Brommer 1937: 198ff.

⁴². On the Attic red-black figured vases is depicted the process of Hephaestus' return to Olympus on an ass. This testimony of the process is not mentioned by Paus. and Lib.; cf. Uerschels 1962: 38 with n.135.

⁴³. Uerschels 1962: 38 with n.136.

The reference to the episode of Hephaestus' return has an allegoric value.⁴⁴ The orator calls attention to the enigmatic character of the tale. It gives the impression of a “*riddle*”: ὥς μὲν αἰνιγμά ἐστιν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ δῆλον, however, its point is considered explicitly clear: the power of the god is invincible.

Aristides avoiding monotony and predictability in his praise aims to praise every aspect of gods' activity. Dionysus is a god of an essentially different type from the Olympian deities, a giver of joy (§6), a successful reconciler of divine disputes, and a soother of cares (§7 the latter described by his epithet *Lyaos*). Aristides further illustrated the extreme ability of the god in achieving even the most unfeasible things which fall beyond every expectation. “*He can give wings even to asses*”. The comic implication is that he is more powerful than Poseidon, father of the winged horse Pegasus.

The point is also illustrated with a quotation from Alcman whose authority is attested in Aristides' usual style: “*Λακωνικὸς ποιητής*” (cf. *Or.* XXVIII.51 *Λάκωνος*). Aristides refers to Alcman (*fr.* 56 P.) as evidence for the episode of Dionysus' ability *λεόντων γάλα ἀμέλγειν*.⁴⁵ The lion's milk symbolises something impossible which for a god's power is feasible.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 283

The style of paragraphs (6-7) is characterised by a parabolic tone. Aristides scrupulously collected a number of myths and *sententiae* to illustrate the invincible power of the god and this is for the orator the best praise for the honoured divinity.

Aristides probably cited Pindar (*fr.* 283), Alcman (*fr.* 56), and the mythic allusion to Poseidon's horses from either his private notes that contained a catalogue of stock-phrases of praise, or it was the result of personal reading not previously synthesized in this way.

⁴⁴. On the allegoric interpretation of the myths referred by Aristides cf. Amann 1931: 16.

⁴⁵. For a discussion of the quotation from Alcman *fr.* 56 P. cf. Uerschels 1962: 40-1.

II.1.5 Aristid. 42(6), 2, 338, 1-2K = Pind. Fr. 95.¹

Introduction to *Or. XLII (6) ΛΑΛΙΑ ΕΙΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΝ*

Aristides delivered this oration in the Asclepieion of Pergamum,² perhaps on January 6, AD 177,³ and it has been conjecturally connected with the celebration of the *Night Festival*,⁴ when Aristides, at the God's prompting,⁵ was passing on his way from Smyrna to his Laneion estate after the visit of the emperor Marcus Aurelius to Smyrna.⁶

The speech is composed in a formal hymnal style containing a summary of Asclepius' benefactions to Aristides, both in health (§§6-11), and oratory (§§12-5).⁷

XLII. (6) ΛΑΛΙΑ ΕΙΣ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΝ.

- 12 Ἐμοὶ γάρ, ὦ δέσποτα Ἀσκληπιέ, πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖα, ὥσπερ ὑπεῖ- | 21
πον, παρὰ σοῦ καὶ τῆς σῆς φιланθρωπίας γεγένηται, μέγιστον δὲ | καὶ
πλείστης χάριτος ἄξιον καὶ σχεδὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν οἰκειότατον οἱ | λόγοι. τὸ γὰρ 1
τοῦ Πινδάρου μετέβαλες· ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πάν | τὸν παιᾶνα
ὠρχήσατο, ὡς λόγος, ἐγὼ δέ, εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, ὦν..... ὑπο|κριτῆς εἶναι·
προὔτρεψάς τε γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ τῆς ἀσκή|σεως κατέστης ἡγεμών.
13 καὶ οὐκ ἀπέχρη ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ἃ καὶ τούτοις | εἰκὸς ἦν ἀκολουθεῖν, καὶ 5
τούτων ἐπεμελήθης, ὅπως ἔσται σοι | τὸ ἔργον ἐν δόξῃ. καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐ
πόλις, οὐκ ἰδιώτης, οὐ τῶν | εἰς ἄρχοντας τελούντων, ὅς οὐ καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν
ἡμῖν ὁμιλήσας οὐκ | ἡσπάσατο εἰς ὅσον οἶός τε ἦν τὸν ἔπαινον ἐκτείνων, οὐ
τῶν ἐμῶν, | οἶμαι, λόγων ταῦτα ἐργαζομένων, ἀλλὰ σοῦ τοῦ κυρίου.

2 *lacunam ind. Rsk., quem secutus* ὦν <σύ ἐδίδαξας λόγων, ἡξιούμην τούτων> ὑποκριτῆς εἶναι *suppleverim*; <τῶν σὺν ὑποκριτῆς εἶναι >δοκῶ> Canter <τῶν σὺν <λόγων> ὑποκριτῆς εἶμι Schwarz 1. c.

(*Aristid. 42 (6) 2,337-8,1-3 K*).

1. *Vit. Ambr.* p.2, 5 Dr., clearly connects the well-known anecdote cited here by Aristides with *fr.95*, which Pindar composed in acknowledgement of the favour that the god granted to him. From *schol. Pyth.* III.139a we learn that *fr.95* was ἐν τοῖς κεχωρισμένοις τῶν Παρθενείδων. The present quotation should be read together with *Or. III.191*, where a slightly different version of the same anecdote is cited, cf. p. 117; for a discussion of Aristides' biographical source see p.122ff.

2. Cf. *Or. XLII.1, 4*.

3. *Boulanger* (1923: 162), places the oration after the visit of Marcus Aurelius at Smyrna.

4. For the festival of the Night Vigil at Pergamum, cf. *Behr* 1968a: 32 in n.47.

5. For the influence, which dreams had on Aristides' literary career, cf. *Behr* 1968a: 45-6.

6. The emperor Marcus and his family stopped at Smyrna after the suppression and death of the rebel Avidius Cassius (autumn 176). Aristides declaimed before the emperor. The subject of the speech is lost.

7. *Behr* (*Aristides* 1981: vol.II.416, n.1), argues very plausibly that *Orr. XLII-XLVI* may have belonged to a "tomus", on the ground that all these orations involve "tempests" whether metaphorical (cf. §§1,7) or actual, and are quite separate from that of *Orr. XXXVII-XLI* and *LIII*. The later unit might be titled *Μαντευτοί*, and was already known to Menander in the 3rd century AD, who refers to an oration to Asclepius included in this collection (*Περὶ Ἐπιδεικτικῶν*, vol. III, p.344 Sp.). Cf. the title *Μαντευτοί* to *Or. XXXVII*; and *Behr Aristides* 1981: vol.II.409, n.1 to *Or. XXXVII*.

Aristides' context

The generosity (φιλανθρωπία)⁸ of Asclepius granted Aristides many and various gifts. The god revived Aristides' despondent spirits by encouraging him to resume his abandoned career. Asclepius passed from teacher to critic⁹ and patron¹⁰ (cf. §11), in revealing means of study, lyric poetry, subjects for speeches, and actual ideas.¹¹

However, only one of the gifts is the most precious, deserving the most gratitude and this is the art of oratory.¹² This god's gift is magnificent and deserves a brilliant compliment.

Aristides who was susceptible to the idea of divine favour, illustrates his relation to the deity with a reference to Pindar's poetry. The relation of Pindar to Aristides is that both are composing words (poetry/oratory). Very ingeniously he alludes to an anecdote that he employed almost a dozen years before in his "*defence of the Four*" (§191).

The Pan-Pindar episode

This anecdote is recorded in *vit. Ambr.* (C 222 inf., 2.5 Dr.), where we are told that Pan was seen singing παιᾶνα Πινδάρου between the mounts Κιθαिरῶν and Ἑλικῶν.¹³ This event was especially favoured by the ancient biographic tradition, and the belief that Pan could manifest himself through music and song was a popular one.¹⁴

Lefkowitz has shown that the ancient biographers could have deduced the anecdote either from allusions to the circumstances of performance in the song itself, or from a direct invitation to the god to join in their song.¹⁵

8. 'Philanthropia' is a term that has aroused considerable interest among scholars of the last half-century, having been studied not only as a concept in Greek literature but also in relation to the Latin *humanitas*. Cf. the discussion in **Martin** 1961: 164ff.

9. Cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).50; *Or.* XLII.15.

10. Cf. *Ors.* XXVIII.156; XXXIII.2; XXX.4.

11. Cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).26.

12. In §5 we are told that the god distributed to mankind both universal benefactions and individual gifts. Oratory is classified in the second group.

13. Eust., *prooem.* 27, follows the tradition of *vit. Ambr.* Cf. **Irigoin** 1952: 241-2; **Gallo** 1977: 50-1.

14. Cf. the god's epithets χορευτής adesp. 937.3 *PMG*, Orph. *Εὐχή* 9Q.; Ἰακχε φιλοχορευτά *Ar. Ra.* 404; χοραγός adesp. 140 *TGF*; χορεῖος *Plut. de cohib. ira* 13 p.462B, *Quaest. conv.*, 5 p.680B; χόρεος *IG XII* 5.1 134.9. See also the discussion of *fr.*99*, p.107.

15. A similar case is presented in Sappho's tradition. She addresses Aphrodite frequently in his poems and a third-century *ὑπόμνημα* (P.Colon. 5860 fr.1.11-6), lays special emphasis to her relationship with Aphrodite. See **Lefkowitz** 1981: 61.

According to the *vit. Thom.* (5.10 Dr.), it is the god Pan who dances in honour of Pindar. Just as Pan honoured Pindar for poetry, so Asclepius honoured Aristides for oratory. In his case the god composed the speeches and he recited them, functioning as ὑποκριτής. It is noteworthy that in both speeches in which Aristides refers to the anecdote, he connects it with the art of oratory.¹⁶

Aristides creates a double compliment, one in honour of Asclepius and another for his art of oratory. His relation with the divine agent is re-assessed and re-established on a new base, whereas his art becomes sacred since it derives from the god's activity. The orator plays the part of the actor of the divine art.¹⁷

Aristides in a slight variation of the version that he followed in *Or.* III, employs the expression “τὸν παιᾶνα ὠρχήσατο”.¹⁸ It is noteworthy that he specifies here the literary genre of the song, whereas in *Or.* III he uses the vague form “ἄσμάτων”. The παιᾶν mentioned could be either a victory paean or a song with a happy content as it can be gathered by the state of god's euphoria (cf. schol. Aristid. 3,564 Dind.).¹⁹

In this speech Aristides makes his reference to Pindar more personalised. The favour that Pan gave Pindar in his music is paralleled with the gift that Asclepius gave to the orator. The reference to this personal incident of Pindar would have provided a fitting opportunity for Aristides to acknowledge that his oratory had found favour with the god.

¹⁶. The connection is clearer in *Or.* XLII, whereas in *Or.* III the presence of Pan makes the connection possible.

¹⁷. Aristides shows a specific tendency to depict his profession and his role in religious terminology. The orator is called “*mystes*”, and the oratory is a “*sacred religion*”.

¹⁸. Cf. the discussion on p. 119ff.

¹⁹. Haldane (1968: 20 with n. 32), argues that the word “paeon” was extended to all songs of joy.

II. 2 QUOTATIONS IN PRAISE OF INDIVIDUAL(S)

II.2.1 Aristid. 3, 191 (1,356 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr. 95.

According to Plato's view it was the Athenian ἀρχή which set their country on the wrong course, and thus made its ruin inevitable, and the whole blame should be laid on the men in charge at that time.

On the question about the *Four Men*, raised at *Gorgias* (515b6-517a6), Socrates claims that they were neither true statesmen nor successful κόλακες.²⁰ Yet Socrates goes on to describe the *Four Men* as τῶν γε νῦν διακονικώτεροι, in the sense that they were better at providing “ships, walls, and dockyards” (517c2). However, in Plato's reasoning the aim of the true statesman is θεραπεία (517e6) not διακονία.²¹

The memory of Miltiades and Pericles had indeed been blackened by Plato; but Herodotus had vindicated Miltiades, and in the fifth century he was revered and deeply respected by all Athenian democrats as the man who had saved Athens from the Persians.

Aristides' context

In the section §§150-208 Aristides refutes the calumnies against the Athenian statesman that Plato expressed in his *Gorgias* (518c2-519b2). Aristides opposes Plato's devaluation of Miltiades by presenting him as a man of great calibre.

While the rest of Europe conceded water and earth to the Persians, Miltiades summoned the most courageous of the Greeks, proclaiming to the Athenians that they must embark in danger on behalf of Greek freedom.

Aristides compared the Athenian leadership to demigods (δαίμονες §188) in being “saviours of the Greeks”, “protectors from evil”, and in every way “good men”.²² They preserved in their death not only Attica, and even all the rest of Greece, in defence of which they stood in the line of battle. They also formed a real example of sacrifice for posterity in restraining the aggressors (§189).

²⁰. Cf. *Grg.* 502d₁₀-503d₄. Plato supports the idea that political oratory is a form of κολακεία. (Cf. *Hypothesis*, p.436, 12ff, vol. III Dind. τεταρτημόριον κολακείας γίγνεται ἡ ῥητορική).

²¹. According to Dodds (1990: 360), the fault in Plato's view, lay not in their incompetence but in their misconception of the statesman's task which is primarily educational - he defined it in the *Laws* 650b6 as τὰς φύσεις τε καὶ ἔξεις τῶν ψυχῶν ... θεραπεύειν.

²². This is a free quotation of Hes. *Op.* 122-3. The quoted text differs from that in Hesiod. However, we should not lay the corruption in the quoted text to Aristides' charge. Behr (*Aristides* 1986: vol.I.465, n.203), has found this version in Plato and elsewhere differing widely from that in the Mss of Hesiod. I do not think that Aristides took the quote from Plato since he shows knowledge of the original context: ἦν ἐκεῖνος εἰς τὴν τελευτὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ γένους ἐποίησεν εἰπῶν.

III. (XLVI D.) ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΤΤΑΡΩΝ.

190 ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτε καὶ τοῖς |
 τελευτήσασιν αὐτῶν οὐ χαμᾶζε ἔπεσεν τὸ κέρδος, ἀλλ' ἀπέλαυσαν τῆς |
 διανοίας καὶ αὐτοὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες τῆς ἐκείνων, πόσον τι | 5
 191 τοῖς γε ζῶσιν καὶ κρατήσασιν περιεγένετο; οἶμαι δ' ἔγωγε καὶ τὸν | Ἡρακλέα
 καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην ἀπαντήσαντας καὶ συστρατη-
 γήσαντας Μιλτιάδην μάρτυρας ἀξιόχρεως τῆς ἀνδρείας τῆς ἐκείνου | πρὸς
 ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι καὶ φέρειν οὐκ ἐλάττω τοῦτο Μιλτιάδην |
 φιλοτιμίαν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν πολιτείαν ἢ Πινδάρῳ φασὶν εἰς τὴν μουσικὴν | 10
 192 τὸ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον θεὸν ὀρχήσασθαι τι τῶν ἁσμάτων αὐτῷ. καὶ
 μὴν | τεχνικόν γε εἶναι περὶ λόγους Πᾶνα τὸν Ἑρμοῦ Πλάτωνος ἢ φωνή· |
 ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ καὶ λόγον αὐτὸν εἶναι λέγει, ἥτοι λόγου γε ἀδελφόν. φαίνεται |
 τοίνυν οὗτος οὕτως αὐτῷ χαίρων τῷ Μιλτιάδῃ, οὐκ ἂν, εἰ γε ἑώρα |
 φαῦλον περὶ τοὺς λόγους ὄντα. 15

(Aristid. 3,190-92 (1,356 L.-B.))

In §§191-2 Aristides presents Miltiades not only as a brave general and successful statesman, but also as adroit rhetor, refuting in that way Plato's argumentation. The orator lays special weight on three aspects of the personality of the Athenian leader:

- a. his ἀνδρεία,
- b. his πολιτεία, and
- c. his [ρήτορικός] λόγος.

The god Heracles, those who appeared in the battle, and the fellow-generals of Miltiades constitute the best satisfactory witness for his *courage* (ἀνδρεία) for all men. The divine authority primarily, the military leadership, and the body of the warriors forms the most tangible proof of Miltiades' ἀνδρεία.

More versatile is the defence of Miltiades' *administration* (πολιτεία).²³ Aristides attempts a subtle comparison between Miltiades and Pindar in respect of their τέχνη, aiming to stress that the administration of the Athenian leader is of equal quality to the music of the Theban poet, as it is proved from its tradition.

²³. Cf. LSJ s.v. πολιτεία: II. government, administration (Ar. Eq. 219); III. civil policy, constitution of the state (Antiph. 3.12.1), form of government (Pl. R. 562a).

The cohesive link for both figures is the god Pan whose epiphany to Pindar and Miltiades bestows honour on them and furthermore forms a kind of verification of their corresponding quality:

(191) “it bears no less honour for Miltiades in regard to his whole administration than does the tradition for Pindar in respect to his music, that this same god danced one of his songs.”

The scholia *ad loc.* note Aristides' oratorical skill (*vis oratoris*):

(172,9) δεινῶς δὲ ὁ Ἀριστείδης τὴν βοήθειαν τῶν θεῶν μαρτυρίαν ποιεῖται τῆς Μιλτιάδου ἀρετῆς. (BD).

The god Pan secured for the Greeks the victory of Marathon at 490 BC. According to Herodotus (6.105-6), the ἡμεροδρόμης Philippides (or Pheidippides)²⁴ was sent to request help from Sparta before the battle of Marathon. On his way back he is said to have had the vision of the god Pan, who promised help against the Persians.²⁵

Aristides draws a parallel between the action of the god in regard to Miltiades' administration and an anecdote concerning his epiphany with respect to Pindar' music.

The anecdote in the biographical tradition and Aristides.

This anecdote is recorded in *vit. Ambr.* (2.5 Dr.), where we are told that Pan was seen singing παιᾶνα Πινδάρου between the mounts Κιθαιρών and Ἐλικών.

The biographer invented this story illustrating both the outstanding favour (“theophilia”)²⁶ that Pindar was granted by the god Pan in dancing one of his compositions,²⁷ and also the fact that Pindar reached the pinnacle of his success – his poetry appeals even to the gods. These two points are implied explicitly in Aristides' treatment of Miltiades.

24. For both names cf. How-Wells 1912: 107.

25. Hdt. 6.105-6 περί τὸ Παρθένιον ὄρος τὸ ὑπὲρ Τεγέης ὁ Πᾶν περιπίπτει βῶσαντα δὲ τὸ οὔνομα τοῦ Φιλίππιδεω τὸν Πᾶνα Ἀθηναίοισι κελεύσαι ἀπαγγεῖλαι δι' ὃ τι ἐωυτοῦ οὐδεμίαν ἐπιμελείην ποιεῦνται, ἐόντος εὐνόου Ἀθηναίοισι καὶ πολλαχῇ γενομένου σφι ἤδη χρησίμου, τὰ δ' ἔτι καὶ ἐσομένου. As a consequence of which the Athenians gave him after the battle a cave-shrine on the Acropolis. The text of Hdt. is followed by the scholiast on Aristid. (3, 563-4 Dind.). For Pan's connection with other scenes of battle against the Persians see A. Pers. 449, Plut. *vit. Aristid.* 11 (Plataea).

26. See *vit. Ambr.* p.2,1-2 Dr. ἦν δὲ οὐ μόνον εὐφυῆς ποιητής, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄνθρωπος θεοφιλῆς.

27. It is possible that Pindar's song was sang in the time of the composition of the Hellenistic *vitae* from which the later biographers drew.

Aristides must have in mind an anecdote similar to that recorded in the later biographic tradition. In this perspective we have to consider the following two possibilities:

1. If in the *βίος* used by Aristides Pan was singing a Pindaric composition, his expression “ὀρχήσασθαι τι τῶν ᾠμάτων αὐτῷ” can be better explained by the fact that the ‘music’ and ‘dance’ are two elements closely connected in ancient music. The odes and hymns were also composed for public dancing performance. In this prospective Aristides, who probably knew the story from a Pindaric *vita* (represented by the later *vit. Ambr.*), replaced in *Or.* III ‘ᾄδων’ with ‘ὀρχήσασθαι’ and likewise in *Or.* XLII we are told that Pan is dancing a Pindaric *paean*.

2. If Aristides' source had that Pan “danced” a Pindaric song, Aristides would seem to follow a tradition similar to that represented by the later *vit. Thom.*

On balance the verbal agreement of *vit. Thom.* with Aristides' quotation gives more weight to the later possibility. One should also notice the additional agreement of *vit. Thom.* with schol. Aristid. (3, 564 Dind.), on the connection of Pan with Pelops.²⁸

Aristides tries to refute Plato's criticism by pointing out that Miltiades was honoured by a god. The biographical account of Pindar's relation to Pan, constitutes a distinct pattern for Aristides to picture Miltiades' reputation as not unequal to that Pindar granted to by the god. It is important here to note the sophisticated style of Aristides in attempting a subtle comparison between Miltiades and Pindar in respect of their τέχναι, through his references and allusions to Pindar and Plato. This comparison is further emphasised through the litotes: καὶ φέρειν οὐκ ἐλάττω.

Aristides attaches to the anecdote historical and religious significance. The epiphany of the god in both cases is considered by Aristides to be a real event, which reflects credit on both Pindar and Miltiades. Moreover, this connection functions as compliment to the personality of the Athenian leader, since the god is his fervent supporter and also finds extra pleasure – as we shall see – in his rhetorical skill.²⁹

²⁸. Cf. the discussion of Aristides' source.

²⁹. Cf. schol. Aristid.3, 565 Dind. ἄρα γε στρατηγήσαντες, φησὶν, οἱ δύο θεοὶ τῷ Μιλτιάδῃ, ὃ τε Ἡρακλῆς καὶ ὁ Πάν, ἔδειξαν αὐτὸν καὶ τοῖς λόγοις σοφὸν καὶ τῇ δυνάμει ἀνδρεῖον· ὁ γὰρ λόγος, φησὶν, ἐστὶν ὁ Πάν, ἡ δὲ ἀνδρεία ὁ Ἡρακλῆς. BD.

τεχνικόν γε εἶναι περὶ λόγους Πᾶνα:

Plato attacking *the Four*, explicitly expresses the view that they were neither true orators nor real κόλακες (*Grg.* 517a 1-6).³⁰ Aristides shows a thorough knowledge of Plato, which is apparent in his frequent citations, and allusion, as well as in stylistic borrowings.

The third point of Aristides' argument concerns the value of Miltiades as orator: The god Pan forms another point of reference. The soundness of this allegation is proved by the fact that Pan, who is technically proficient in oratory and even the brother of oratory,³¹ is clearly delighted with Miltiades being an adroit orator.

The literary patterns that Aristides had in mind in the formulation of this paragraph (192), were Plato's prayer to Pan at the end of *Phdr.* 263d and a passage in *Cra.* 408d. Pan the son of Hermes is here explicitly mentioned among the ἐντόπιοι θεοί as representing the natural eloquence.³²

In the *Phdr.* (263d 5-6), Socrates acknowledges Pan as the inspirer of his speech: the Nymphs, daughters of Achelous and Pan, son of Hermes have turned out to be τεχνικώτεροι ... πρὸς λόγους, more skilled in the use of words, than Lysias the son of Cephalus. He is, in terms of the *Phaedo*, the λόγος who leads the speakers. And this fits in with what we find in the *Cratylus* (408d 2): Pan is either λόγος or λόγου ἀδελφός, if he is the son of Hermes.³³

The Biographical source of Aristides for *Ors.* III.191 and XLII.12

Ancient references to the Pan–Pindar episode abound, with Antipater's epigram as the earliest quotation. Therefore, Aristides' testimony makes an interesting point, since the author is prepared to accept not uncritically the validity of the biographical evidence.

³⁰. ὅτι οὐδένα ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν γεγονότα τὰ πολιτικά ἐν τῇδε τῇ πόλει ὥστε, εἰ οὗτοι ῥήτορες ἦσαν, οὔτε τῇ ἀληθινῇ ῥητορικῇ ἐχρῶντο — οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐξέπεσον — οὔτε τῇ κολακικῇ. According to **Dodds** (1990: 360), the true political leadership described at 504d, has as its objective the moral reform of society: if society eventually rejects the leader, this is interpreted by Socrates, that the objective has not been achieved.

³¹. Λόγου ἀδελφόν = λόγος here means “oratory”.

³². **de Vries** 1969: *ad loc.* (*Phdr.* 263d5-6).

³³. According to **Rosenmeyer** (1962: 37), the whole argument is characteristically opaque: Hermes invented speech, or is concerned with speech; Pan is the son of Hermes; hence Pan is speech or the brother of speech. Cf. also the analysis of **Baxter** 1992: 145-6; and **Burger** 1980: 150 n.67.

It is quite probable that Aristides quarried the alluded anecdote from an unknown *vita*.

In recent years it has become commonplace to accept that neither the apparently autobiographical statements of Pindar in his *Epinicians* nor the snippets of information about his life surviving from the Hellenistic biographies bear much relation to literal truth. Haldane argues that these accounts are based on an incident alluded to in Pindar's song.³⁴ Although the anecdote is a biographers' invention, Aristides in both testimonies (*Ors.* III; XLII) seems to treat this as a real event for purely rhetorical purposes, giving it – as we have argued – a religious colouring. The anecdote illustrates the relation with the divine agent. This interpretation is also reflected in other ancient sources.

The anecdote has aroused considerable interest among scholars in late antiquity. The following table aims to show that the ancient testimonies give various versions of the same story, and it is therefore interesting to see with which version Aristides sides himself. It is noteworthy that in the following testimonies the imagined circumstances of performance are more carefully preserved than the poet's words:

1	Schol. <i>Pyth.</i> III.139 a	πάρεδρος γὰρ ὁ Πάν τῇ 'Ρέα, ὡς αὐτὸς ὁ Πίνδαρος ἐν τοῖς κεχωρισμένοις τῶν Παρθενείων (<i>fr.</i> 95) φησὶν· ὦ Πάν 'Αρκαδίας μεδέων, ἕως τοῦ Ματρὸς μεγάλας ὁπαδὲ, σεμνῶν Χαρίτων μέλημα τερπνόν.
2	<i>vit. Ambr.</i> p.2,5 Dr.	ὁ γοῦν Πάν ὁ θεὸς ὤφθη μετὰ τοῦ Κιθαιρῶνος καὶ τοῦ Ἑλικῶνος ᾄδων παιᾶνα Πινδάρου· διὸ καὶ ᾄσμα ἐποίησεν εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ᾧ χάριν ὁμολογεῖ τῆς τιμῆς αὐτῷ (<i>eadem</i> Eust. <i>prooem.</i> 27 = III 298, 12 Dr.).
3	<i>vit. Thom.</i> p.5,10 Dr.	λόγος καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα εὐρῆσαι ποτε ᾄδοντα περὶ τοῦ Πέλοπος· (? Πᾶνα ὀρχήσασθαι ποτε τὸν αὐτοῦ παιᾶνα καὶ χαίρειν ᾄδοντα τοῦτον αἰεὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι <i>text. vulg. usque ad ed. Boeckhianam</i> : τὸν αὐτοῦ παιᾶνα περὶ τοῦ Πέλοπος E. Abel, <i>Scholia recentia in Pindari Epinicia</i> I [Budapestini-Berolini 1891] 34 <i>ex cod. rec.</i>).
4	<i>vit. metr.</i> 19-20	καὶ μέλος, ὡς ἐνέπουσιν, ἐν οὔρεσιν ἠυκέρως Πάν Πινδάρου αἰὲν ᾄδει, καὶ οὐκ ἐμέγηρεν αἰείδων. (= Eust. <i>prooem.</i> 30 = III 301,27 Dr.).
5	Plut. <i>Non posse suav. vivi</i> 22 p.1103A	καὶ Πίνδαρος ἀκούων ὑπὸ τοῦ Πανὸς ᾄδεσθαι τι μέλος ὧν αὐτὸς ἐποίησε μετρίως ἔχαιρεν;
6	Plut. <i>Num.</i> 4.8 p.62C	Πινδάρου δὲ καὶ τῶν μελῶν ἐραστὴν γενέσθαι τὸν Πᾶνα μυθολογοῦσιν.

³⁴ Haldane 1968: 20-1. He argues for the validity of this biographical evidence. On the other hand Lefkowitz (1981: VII-X), is right in arguing that the anecdotes must not be taken at face-value. She contends (*ibid.* VIII), that ancient biographers took most of their information about poets from the poets' own works.

7	Aristid. 3,191 (1,356 L.-B.)	ἡ Πινδάρῳ φασὶν εἰς τὴν μουσικὴν τὸ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον θεὸν ὀρχήσασθαι τι τῶν ἁσμάτων αὐτῷ.
8	Aristid. 42 (6) 2,338,1-3 K.	τὸ γὰρ τοῦ Πινδάρου μετέβαλες· ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πάν τὸν παιᾶνα ὠρχήσατο, ὡς λόγος.
9	schol.Aristid. 3, 564 Dind.	a. λέγεται ὅτι μέλη ποιῶντος τοῦ Πινδάρου ποτὲ ἐν Θήβαις τερφθεὶς ὁ Πάν ὠρχήσατο αὐτῷ. b. ἄλλοι δὲ, ὅτι ἄσμα σκεψάμενος Πίνδαρος ἐμελλεν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι· καὶ εἶδεν ὄναρ τὸν Πᾶνα λέγοντα αὐτῷ τὸ ἄσμα, καὶ λαβὼν εὐθύς ἀνέθηκε τῷ θεῷ. BD Oxon. c. οἱ δὲ ὑπομνηματισταὶ λέγουσιν ὅτι ἐν τῇ κρεουργίᾳ τοῦ Πέλοπος ὠρχήσατο ὁ Πάν. ἔχομεν δὲ τοῦτο ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ νίκῃ. BD
10	Philostr. Maior Im. 2.12.2, p.358,14 Kayser	φασὶ δὲ αὐτόν (sc.Πᾶνα), ὅτε Πίνδαρος ἐς τὸ ποιεῖν ἀφίκετο, ἀμελήσαντα τοῦ σκιρτᾶν ἄδειν τὰ τοῦ Πινδάρου.
11	Lib. Or. 64.13 (IV p.429,4 Foerster)	τοσαύτῃ δὲ ἄρα κοινωνία λόγων τε ὀρχήσεως ὥστ' ἐποίει μὲν ὁ Πίνδαρος, ὠρχεῖτο δὲ ὁ Πάν τὸ ἄσμα, καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εὐροιμεν ἂν λόγων τε προστάτην καὶ τεχνίτην ὀρχήσεως.
12	Chor. Or. 29.48 (p.327,9 Foerster-Richtsteig)	οὐδὲ τὸν Πᾶνα μελωδίαί τέρπουσιν ἀσελγεῖς, ἐπεὶδὴ σοφοῦ ποιητοῦ πρὸς λύραν ἄδοντος ἀκούσας ἠψφραίνετο, ὥστε καὶ ἐχρῆτο τῇ σύριγγι καὶ ὠρχεῖτο τὸ μέλος.
13	Eust.prooem. 27 (=III 298, 12 Dr.)	ὕμνον δὲ ἀείσας ταῦτόν ἐστι τῷ ἄσας παιᾶνα, τὸν ὡς δεδήλωται Πινδαρικόν, εἰ καὶ ἄλλως ἑτεροῖόν τι παρὰ τὸν ὕμνον ὁ παιάν. Cf. <i>initium hymni Epidaurii in Panem Inscr. Gr. IV 1²,130 (P. Maas, Epidaurische Hymnen, Halle 1933, p.[4] 130) Πᾶνα τὸν νυμφαγέταν, Ναῖδων μέλημ' αἰδῶ, χρυσέων χορῶν ἄγαλμα.</i>
14	Antip. Thess. Apl. 305,5	μάρτυς ὁ Μαινάλιος κερόεις θεὸς ὕμνον ἀείσας τὸν σέο καὶ νομῶν λησάμενος δονάκων.

These sources can be seen from two different viewpoints:

1. Some authors specify the literary genre of the song: παιάν, whereas some others simply mentions ἄσμα or μέλος, and in Philostratus we find τὰ τοῦ Πινδάρου. It is interesting that both *vitae* (*Ambr.* and *Thom.*), agree that the song was a *paean*, whereas Aristides follows both tendencies (*i.e.* in *Or.* III speaks of an ἄσμα, whereas in *Or.* XLII shares παιάν with both *vitae*).

2. This category is represented by the two main *vitae* of Pindar:

a. In *vit. Ambr.* Pan 'sang' Pindar's παιάν.

b. In *vit. Thom.* Pan 'danced' Pindar's παιάν.

The element of ὀρχησις is particularly emphasised in both places where Aristides refers to the same anecdote. In this respect, Aristides' tradition seems to agree more with *vit. Thomana*. This assumption is further supported by the fact that Aristides in both his quotations focuses on the divine honour in which Pindar was held by Pan who danced a song of his (in *Or.* XLII. he specifies the literary gender παιᾶνα ὠρχήσατο). This specific point is explicitly illustrated in the *Bíos* compiled by Thomas Magister. Aristides'

ὠρχήσατο agrees further with Libanius and Choricus. Libanius' testimony is of some interest in echoing Aristides' argument of the §§191-2, (cf. testimonies).

In the light of Aristides' quotation Drachmann ought to have accepted the other version which he printed in his *apparatus*: Πᾶνα ὠρχήσασθαι ποτε τὸν αὐτοῦ παιᾶνα καὶ χαίρειν ᾄδοντα τοῦτον ἀεὶ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι. This version has Mss support. It is transmitted in family V, which is represented by the Mss: EHKQQ^bΘ.

Vita Thomana was based on *ancestors*, which were split from other Mss at a very early date. It is probable that a *ὑπόμνημα* was available to Aristides, which may have contained a biography of Pindar very similar to *vit. Thom.*

The scholia on Aristid. *ad loc.* seem to be of special interest in summarising the main points of the transmitted story (cf. testimonia):

- a. Pan was gratified by Pindar's music.
- b. Pan did not sing but danced a paeon / song. (cf. Chor. Or. 29.48 to the accompaniment of a syrinx).
- c. Epiphany of the god: Pan dictates the song in a dream.
- d. Pan was found singing the story of Pelops in *Ol. I.* (cf. *vit. Thom.* p.5,10 Dr.).

It is interesting here to see how the divergence in the biographical tradition ensued. The author of the *Ambrosian Bíos* cites Chamaeleon and Istros as his authorities. Since Chamaeleon was a biographer of the early third century BC, we can assume that these tales were current within a century or more of Pindar's death reflecting the deeply religious nature of his poetry. So by the time of the Hellenistic scholars, a full biographical corpus was already compiled, since Pindar's poetry was already the subject of Hellenistic scholarship. These anecdotal accounts were further organised and systematised by Didymos, Theon, Chamaeleon and Istros.³⁵

A comparative examination of their surviving testimonies recorded in *vit. Ambr.* with P.Oxy. 2438 ('Life of Pindar') suggest that these biographers record different aspects of Pindar's life picking whatever they like from an original longer Hellenistic *vita*. In the next stage of the transmission, the scribes of these Mss made a selection recording different bits of information cutting out less important material, and this may account for

³⁵. Dicaearchus perhaps wrote on Pindar in his book *περὶ μουσικῶν ἀγώνων* (cf. Irigoin 1952: 20). The biographer of *vit. Ambr.* records a list of similar anecdotes and miraculous events about Pindar's life.

the divergence in some details that figure in the later four *vitae* (i.e. *Ambr.*, *Thom.*, *metr.*, the entry in *Sudas*; cf. *Eust. prooem.*²⁷ [=III 298, 9ff. Dr.]).

This selective tendency is followed by Aristides and other Imperial age authors and finally is reflected in the surviving *vitae*, which in turn draw on Hellenistic predecessors.³⁶ We can see that these *vitae* contain sets of information that do not always agree in a considerable number of details. There are certain picturesque insertions which occur only in some accounts. Thus, in *vit. Ambr.* we have pieces of information that are absent from *vit. Thom.*, and vice-versa. In *vit. Ambr.* we have the geographical details (Helicon and Cithaeron), that are absent in *vit. Thom.* which connects the anecdote with the story of Pelops in *Ol. I.*³⁷

³⁶ *Vit. Ambr.* knows the pattern of Aristophanes' edition: γέγραφε δὲ βιβλία ἑπτακαίδεκα ὕμνους, παιᾶνας... (Dr. I, p.3,6).

³⁷ I did not find any trace of this version in the extant scholia on Pindar.

II.2.2 Aristid. 31(11), 2, 215, 6-7K = Pind. Fr. *136a.

Introduction to *Or. XXXI* (11) *ΕΙΣ ΕΤΕΩΝΕΑ ΕΠΙΚΗΔΕΙΟΣ*

Aristides delivered *Or. XXXI* to mourn the death of his pupil Eteoneus in the earthquake of AD 161, which devastated Cyzicus and partially destroyed the temple of Hadrian.¹ This little oration in formal style comes from the peak of Aristides' career, when he enjoyed good health.

Aristides considers the poetry of Simonides and Pindar as the most appropriate in rendering the rhetoric of lamentation. We can detect a trace of purely aesthetic judgement in Aristides' praise of their dirges (§2).

Simonides' *Θρῆνοι* were highly appreciated in antiquity, especially his skilfulness in the treatment of “*pathos*”, in which he was considered unrivalled.² Simonides, apropos of the death of the prince of Thessaly Antiochos, composed a dirge (528 *PMG*) which was considered as the most classical pattern of this genre. It seems that in its composition he was inspired by the love of Antiochos' mother Dyseris to whom Aristides likens Eteoneus' mother in her grief for her son (§2).

XXXI. (11) *ΕΙΣ ΕΤΕΩΝΕΑ ΕΠΙΚΗΔΕΙΟΣ.*

2 ποῖος ταῦτα Σιμωνίδης |
 θρηνήσει, τίς Πίνδαρος ποῖον μέλος ἢ λόγον τοιοῦτον ἐξευρών; | τίς χορὸς 10
 ἄξιον φθέγγεται τοιούτου πάθους; ποία δὲ Δύσ|ηρις Θετταλὴ τοσοῦτο
 πένθος ἐπένησεν ἐπ' Ἀντιόχῳ τελευτή|σαντι, ὅσον νῦν μητρὶ τῇ τούτου
 πένθος πρόκειται;

(*Aristid. 31 (11) 2,212,6-7 K*).

Aristides' context

Aristides dwelling on Eteoneus' birth, character, moral excellence, and education, in paragraphs 11-3, and before the section of the consolation, speaks about the Lament for the young Eteoneus.

1. Behr 1968a: 92-4.

2. Quintilianus, *Institutiones Oratoriae* 10, 1, 64; Catullus writes in consolation of one of his friends: “*paulum quid lubet allocutionis maestius lacrimis Simonideis*” 38, 7-8.

12 ὦ νυμφίου (σύ) γ' ἐλεεινότερος ἄρτι | 26
καομένου καὶ στεφάνοις μᾶλλον πρέπων [ἢ θρηνεῖν], οἶαν ἐν ὥρᾳ | τὴν 1
ἁωρίαν ἐκίνησας, ὥς, πρὶν ὑμέναιον ἄσθῆναί σοι καιρὸν εἶναι, | τοὺς θρήνους
ᾄδειν κατέλαβεν. ὦ σχῆμα κάλλιστον, ὦ φθέγμα | κοινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν
αὐξανόμενον, οἷχῃ δὴ προοιμιασάμενος, τοσοῦτον εὐφράνας, ὅσον λυπῆσαι 5
μειζόνως. ἐπέρχεται μοι τὸ τοῦ | Πινδάρου (frg. 136) προσθεῖναι, 'ἄστρα τε
13 καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ κύματα πόντου' τὴν ἁωρίαν τὴν σὴν ἀνακαλεῖ. ὦ τοῦ
δευτέρου πτώματος, οἷος ἐφ' οἷω τῷ νεῷ κεῖσθαι ὦ τῆς ἐπιθήκης, οἷον αὖ τὸ
| δεύτερον ἡμῖν ἔσεισεν ὦ τοῦ τραγικοῦ δαίμονος, ὃς προδείξας | ἀρτίως
βουλευτήρια καὶ λόγους καὶ ζῆλον καὶ χαρὰν πόρρω τούτων | ἐν βραχεῖ 10
κατέκλεισεν τὸ δράμα. ὦ συμφοραὶ κοινὰ λογίων καὶ | χθονίων θεῶν.

(Aristid. 31 (11) 2,214-15,6-7, 3-5 K).

The death of the young Eteoneus, caused by the earthquake that destroyed the temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus AD 161, is mourned by Aristides as a double disaster. He laments that he has to offer a dirge for his untimely death instead of singing his wedding song, something that increases the tragedy of what happened to young Eteoneus.

In the section (§§1-3) concerned with the "lament", Aristides employing cult terminology³ calls the unhappy mother (§11): "καλλίτεκνος" (with a "handsome son"), and her son Eteoneus (§12): "ὦ σχῆμα κάλλιστον" and "ὦ φθέγμα κοινὸν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν αὐξανόμενον" (most handsome figure! A voice being perfected for all the Greeks in common!),⁴ having given much delight, whose unexpected death increased the subsequent pain. This calamitous event recalls for Aristides a Pindaric verse in which he sees an analogy.

³. Behr (Aristides 1981: vol.II. 393 n.8), thinks of a cult term applied to Apollo. Aristides uses 'καλλίτεκνος' twice as an epithet for Asclepius ("he of the handsome child"): ἦν ἅμα μὲν Ἀσκληπιός, ἅμα δὲ Ἀπόλλων, ὃ τε δὴ Κλάριος καὶ ὁ καλλίτεκνος καλούμενος ἐν Περγᾶμω Hieros Logos 2 (24).18; cf. Or. LII.4. It also qualifies Leto in Or. XXXVII.18 τὰ γὰρ τῆς καλλίτέκνου γέρα λαμβάνει. Cf. LSJ s.v. (with beautiful children): Arist. 672W (initium) καλλίτέκνου μητρὸς θύγατερ, IG 12(7).477 (Amorgos), Inscr. Prien. 225 (Aug.): Comp., Luc. DDeor. 16.1, 18.1.

⁴. Both expressions seem to be Pindaric in their conception: cf. fr. 188 φθέγμα μὲν πάγκοινον ἔγνωκας Πολυμνάστου Κολοφωνίου ἀνδρός; and Pyth. IV.123 γόνον ἰδὼν κάλλιστον ἀνδρῶν.

Pindar Fr. *136a

The fragment itself gives virtually no information about the exact occasion and the particulars of its presentation. In addition, the other extant fragments from *Θρηνοι* provide no indication of context either in themselves or in the passages of Plutarch (*consol. ad Apoll.* 35 p.120 C-D) and Plato (*Men.* 81b-c) in which they are quoted.

THRENI FR. *136a (101).

ἄστρα τε καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ κύματα πόντου
τὴν ἄωρίαν τὴν σὴν ἀνακαλεῖ

Aristid. 31(11), 2,215,6-7 K. *idem paulo ante* p.212, 9K. ποῖος ταῦτα Σιμωνίδης θρη-
νήσει, τίς Πίνδαρος ποῖον μέλος ἢ λόγον τοιοῦτον ἐξευρών;
κύματ' ἀγκαλεῖ σε πόντου *proposuit Schroeder plura ex Aristide recuperans*

From Aristides' interpretation it seems probable that Pindar had treated similarly the theme of the untimely death.⁵ Nature is personified and participates in the grief. This topic appealed to poets already in the sixth and fifth centuries⁶ and was particularly favoured by the Hellenistic poets and the 'epitaphion' epigram.⁷ Pindar, however, creates a variation by presenting the whole universe, the sky, and the sea as participating in the threnos.⁸

The source for Pind. Fr. *136a

A funeral oration offers an obvious occasion for consolatory thoughts. Aristides employed standardised vocabulary and expressions that he also used in describing similar scenes concerning disaster of cities or individuals. This is also indicative of the likelihood that in this speech the quotations from poetry, which in their majority concern lamentation, were used in similar declamations.⁹

⁵. Cf. Cannatà Fera 1990: 211.

⁶. Biese (1882: 20ff.), speaks for the "sympathized" nature of the sixth and fifth century. Cf. Cannatà Fera 1990: *ad loc.* n.7.

⁷. Moschus starts his epitaph for Bion (*Epitaph. Adon.* 31) with an invocation of nature, cf. Theoc. 1,115. The topic appealed also to tragic poets: Aesch. *Per.* 61ff. οὐς πέρι πᾶσα χθών Ἀσιῆτις θρέψασα πόθῳ στένεται μαλερῶι, cf. *Sept.* 900; Eur. *Tr.* 826.

⁸. For the threnos generally and the related matters, see Alexiou 1974: esp. ch.6.

⁹. Similar vocabulary is employed in the "*Monody for Smyrna*" (*Or.* XVIII.5), describing the state of Smyrna after its earthquake: ὥσπερ δὲ ἀγαλμα ἀκριβῶς πεποικιλμένον πάντη περιόντι θεῶν ἔχει, οὕτω σοι τῇ πρότερον μὲν ὠραιότατῃ πόλεω, νυνὶ δ' ἄωρίαν α....., περιῆν ἀφ' ὅτου τις αἰ

Simonides and Pindar were appreciated in the rhetoric schools, and students were probably encouraged to cite verses from their poetry, which were considered suitable to the solemnity that pertains to the style.

We can assume that collections of wailing / consolatory quotations were widely circulated in that time. It is probable that by the first / second century AD, Pindar's *Θρῆνοι* may have been excerpted and listed in anthologies. This assumption finds some support in the texts of Plutarch and Clemens, who both quote from Pindar's *Θρῆνοι*, without being interested in the original context of the poems. This suggests the possibility that both drew on these anthological collections.

Plutarch's quotations are of some interest. His introductory notes in *consol. ad Apoll.* 35 p.120C 3-4, indicate that he probably cited them from an anthology recording their rubrics: *i.* Λέγεται δ' ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ μελικοῦ Πινδάρου ταυτὶ περὶ τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐν "Αἰδου; *ii.* ...περὶ ψυχῆς λέγων (C 15). Immediately after Plutarch quotes *fr.* 129.1-10, in which Pindar described a feast in Hades, focusing on the state of the pious.

On a similar occasion Aristides preserves a reminiscence from this Pindaric *θρῆνος* (*fr.*129), in his *ἐπιτάφιος* speech, composed for his teacher Alexander.

Aristides seems to follow the same tradition; in all likelihood he quoted *fr.**136a from an anthology. On the other hand he shows a knowledge of Simonides' *Θρῆνος* in drawing a comparison between Dyseris and Eteoneus' mother.

We should not take the introductory: ἐπέρχεται μοι τὸ τοῦ Πινδάρου προσθεῖναι, as an indication that Aristides quotes from memory.¹⁰ It is more plausible to think that the rhetorical intention of Aristides is to make a logical connection between Eteoneus' ἄωρία and the case of an untimely death that Pindar had treated in his *Θρῆνος*.

θεωροίη. νῦν δὴ τὸ κάλλιστον εἶδος παρέσται δοκεῖν, τοῦτο μὲν ἐξαίφνης ἐκφανῆς ἐγγιγνομένη, τοῦτο δὲ ἀπαντικρὺ γιγνομένῳ, τοῦτο δ' ἐκ προαστείων, ἐκ πορθμῶν, ἐκ πελάγους, ἐκ γῆς, ἐκ θαλάττης. Cf. *Or.* XIX.3.

¹⁰. For a similar way see Luc. *VH* 1.29 ἐμνήσθην Ἀριστοφάνους.

II.2.3 Aristid. 32(12), 2, 225, 18-9K = Pind. *Fr.* 129.7.

Introduction to *Or.* XXXII (12) *ΕΠΙ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΩΙ ΕΠΙΤΑΦΙΟΣ*

On the occasion of his teacher's death (150 AD), Aristides sent from Smyrna the present oration in the form of the letter to the people of Cotiaeum. Aristides attended the school of Alexander before he studied under professional orators. All we know about the personality of his teacher comes from this oration. Alexander lectured on and explicated the famous writers of the past. His glory was in proportion to his worth and later he was appointed tutor in Greek literature to Marcus Aurelius (cf. §§13,15,28-30).

Aristides' context

Aristides having illustrated at the preceding paragraphs the unique qualities that only Alexander possessed, he presents at paragraph (34) his teacher as being surrounded with dances of poets in Hades:

34 εἰ δὲ ἀληθεῖς οἱ Πινδάρου λόγοι | 16
καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ παντὸς τοῦ περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον ἐργαστηρίου καὶ | διατριβαί
τινές εἰσι τῶν ἐν ᾿Αιδου, ἧ που νῦν ποιητῶν τε χοροὺς | εἰκὸς ἵστασθαι περὶ
ἐκεῖνον ἀρχομένων ἀπὸ Ὀμήρου...

(Aristid. 32 (12) 2.225.18-9 K).

Aristides may allude to *fr.*129.7, for which we have papyrological support from P.Oxy. 2447 (Π³² fr.38.1-2):

τοὶ δὲ φορμίγγεσσι, τέρπονται, παρὰ δέ σφισιν
εὐανθὲς ἅπας τέθιαλεν ὄλβος·

This is a eulogy for his teacher, whom Aristides genuinely admired and to whom he owed a thorough knowledge of Plato and the lyric poets, especially of Pindar. Aristides' intention is to praise Alexander's scholarly work. He alludes to Pindar's *Θρήνος* — a suitable reference for the nature of his *ἐπιτάφιος* speech. He intentionally introduces Homer as the dance leader, thus creating a compliment for his teacher's interpretative work on both Homer and Pindar. Alexander wrote a treatise on Homer called *Τά ἐξηγητικά*, (cf. XXXII.26).¹¹

¹¹. Cf. p.45.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 129

Regarding the source that Aristides used, it is equally probable that he knew *frs.* 129.7 and *136a from an anthology, like Plutarch.

II.2.4 Aristid. 30(10), 2, 207, 3-4K = Pind. *Ol.* IX. 26.

Introduction to *Or.* XXX (10) *ἈΠΕΛΛΑΙ ΓΕΝΕΘΛΙΑΚΟΣ*.

This speech marks the end of the period of Cathedra (AD 145-147), during which Aristides was an incubant at the temple of Asclepius in Pergamum. The speech is a celebration in a highly artificial style of a pupil¹ of Aristides (§27) on the occasion of his (?) fourteenth birthday.² In January of AD 147, Aristides was commissioned by the powerful Pergamene family of Quadrati to compose the “*Birthday speech to Apellas*”, the offspring of the Quadrati. Apellas served, in honour of his fourteenth birthday, as an Asiarch at the games of the Provincial Assembly (c. February),³ and was to serve as ἀγωνοθέτης, an office open to boys under sixteen, at the festival of Asclepius in August.⁴

Bruno Keil, on alleged historical grounds and stylistic peculiarities, argued against the authenticity of this speech.⁵ Since then, his arguments have not been accepted by the majority of the scholars, who arguing in defence of its genuineness, point to the subscription of the speech.⁶

Aristides' context

Or. XXX is an encomium. Aristides devotes the longest section of the speech to praising the ancestry of Apellas (§§6-15). He is descended from “Kodratos”, a member of an illustrious Pergamene and Galatian family of the Julii Quadrati. Aristides glories in the family's benefactions to Pergamum.⁷ The focus is now turned on Apellas' immediate ancestry, his father Fronto, and his grandfather Apellas.⁸ We know from Aristides that the family did very well under Roman rule.

In the section §§16-22, Aristides refers to Apellas' qualities. Firstly, he dwells on those referring to the body and soul which are illustrated with images from the domain of agriculture.

1. For Aristides as Apellas' teacher, cf. *Προθεωρία*, also XXX.4, 27K.

2. Fourteen was a guess of the scholiast included in the *Προθεωρία* of the speech (cf. Boulanger 1923: 333 n.3). However, the assumption of the *toga virilis* in §25 suggests the age of sixteen.

3. Cf. §§2-3, 21; see Behr 1968a: 57, *id.* 1994: §7.

4. Cf. *Or.* XXX.27; for the games see Behr 1968a: 30 n.41, 32 n.47.

5. Keil (1898: 204-5 n.7), erroneously assumed that the Quadratus of §§7-10 was the consul C. Antius Aulus Julius Quadratus. Keil was followed by Hüttl 1936: Vol.II.36.

6. *Subscr.* γενεθλιακος· ὑπεβλήθη πρό μιᾶς τοῦ ἀναγνωσθῆναι ἐν τῇ καθέδρᾳ τῇ ἐν περγάμῳ αὐτοῦ ὄντος ἐτῶν κθ' Α'; ἀπελλᾶ γενεθλιακός T; cf. Boulanger 1923: 335.

7. Cf. particularly the famous C. Antius Aulus Julius Quadratus εὐεργέτης of Pergamum, see Halfmann 1979: no.17.

8. For the question of the exact relation of Fronto to Apellas senior cf. Swain 1996: 259.

ANONYMI

XXX. (10) ΑΠΕΛΛΑΙ ΓΕΝΕΘΛΙΑΚΟΣ.

- 16 Πῶς δ' οὐχὶ τοῦ |
σωτῆρος αὐτοῦ τὸ πρέμνον, καὶ μάλ' ἐν ἀκηράτοις Χαρίτων | κήποις, ἐξ
οὗ τῆς μακαρίας προῆλθε γαστρός, ἐκτρέφόμενον; | ἔξεστι δ' οὐ μόνον αὐτὸ 5
ταῖς ρίζαις τοῦ γένους, αἱ δὴ προεῖρην|ται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἐπανθοῦσιν αὐτῶ
κατὰ ταυτηνὴ τὴν ἡλικίαν | συμβαλεῖν καὶ μάλ' ἐναργῶς, κακ τῶν εἰς ψυχὴν
17 κακ τῶν εἰς σῶμα | φερόντων οὕτως διελόμενον. τὸ μὲν γε τῆς ψυχῆς
πρᾶον φθάνει | τὴν ἀκμὴν τῆς ἡλικίας σπεῦδον εἰς τὸ γῆρας, οὐ μὲν κεκτηκυῖα
| προσέοικεν ἡ πραότης, οἷαν ἐνεργάσαντο πολλοῖς αἱ κατὰ τὸν | βίον 10
ἀνάγκαι, συνηβᾶ δὲ ἀνακεκραμένη πρέποντι φρονήματι. θεω|ρεῖτω δ' ἀπὸ
τῆς βολῆς τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, εἴ τις ἀπολέλειπται τοῦ | μαθεῖν ἔργῳ τὸ
λεγόμενον· οὔτε γὰρ ἐπανεστᾶσιν ἀτενεῖς οὔτε | ὕπνῳ δὴ τινι καθηρημένοις
ἐοίκασιν ὑπὸ ταπεινότητος, ἀλλ' | ἡσυχῇ σεμνότης ἡμερος ἐγείρει τὸ βλέμμα. 15
18 χάρις τοίνυν, ἡ παισὶν | ἐκ θεῶν δῶρον προτεθεῖσα καθάπερ ἔκ τινος
ὁμολογίας, οὗ τί | που γυμνὴ κατὰ τοὺς ζωγράφους, ἀλλ' αἰδῶ πολλὴν
ἐπαμφιασα|μένη, πᾶσι τοῖς μέρεσιν ἐντέττηκεν.

(Aristid. 30 (10) 2,207,3-4 K).

In §16 the orator develops the unique image of Apellas as a tree:

(16) *"How is he not the tree trunk of the Saviour himself, indeed reared in 'the pure gardens of the Graces' from the time when he came forth from the blessed womb".*

The young boy is portrayed with a budding trunk (πρέμνον), which grows in an "untouched / immaculate" garden of the Charites.

This is a mixed quotation and its component parts consist of words from *Ol.* IX.26 and Eur. *Hipp.* 76-8. Both extracts are merged into one phrase whose authorship is not stated. It is a verbal picture conveying visual action. Aristides is consciously recalling the words of Pindar and Euripides, which are combined into a new verse equally poetic carrying the beauty and the power of its original components:⁹

1. Pindar *Ol.* IX.26

Pindar's songs do not grow in the ordinary gardens and fields of men, but in the meadows of Muses and Charites from where the poet derives his poetic inspiration.

⁹. The practice of joining extracts from two poets in a single quote was common in late antiquity, cf. Bompaigne 1958: 396-7.

Pindar often speaks of himself as gardener and ploughman, harvesting delights from the garden of the Charites:

OLYMPIA IX (466)
 ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν, 25
 εἰ σὺν τινι μοιριδίῳ παλάμα
 ἑξαίρετον Χαρίτων νέμομαι κᾶπον·
 κεῖναι γὰρ ὥπασαν τὰ τέρπν·
 (Ol. IX.25-7).

This is the key-note of Pindar's poetic claims.¹⁰ Here he is tilling the garden of the Charites.¹¹ These divinities are also responsible for the charm (χάρις) splendour and beauty that issues from poetry.¹² Pindar here (l.27) expresses the traditional view that poetry causes enjoyment.¹³

2. Eur. Hipp. 76-8

Euripides in ll.73-7, a passage which gives to the play its ancient title *Στεφανηφόρος*, presents Hippolytus offering to the statue of Artemis a garland fashioned from a “virgin meadow” with the following lines:

ΙΠΠΟΛΥΤΟΣ
 Ἰπ. σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηράτου 73
 λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω,
 ἔνθ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιῷ φέρβειν βοτὰ 75
 οὔτ' ἤλθέ πω σίδηρος, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον
 μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἥρινή διέρχεται,
 Αἰδῶς δὲ ποταμίαισι κηπεύει δρόσοις,
 (Eur. Hipp. 73-8).

The λειμῶν is qualified by ἀκήρατος,¹⁴ which indicates land sacred to a god (Artemis), inaccessible to humans.¹⁵ The repetition of ἀκήρατος in l.76 reinforces the point and this has to be seen in the climax achieved with the οὔτε ... οὔτ' of the Mss.¹⁶

10. The scholiasts see the expression as a compliment for various cities: cf. schol. *Pyth.* VI.1d 'Ακράγας; V.31 κῆπον 'Αφροδίτης τὴν Κυρήνην ὠνόμασεν. However, they see an allegory for poetry schol. *Ol.* 39a τὴν ποιητικὴν λέγει, δι' ἧς ἔστι χαρίσασθαι. b. ἄλλως· κᾶπον· τὸν ποιητικόν.

11. The ploughing metaphor is fully developed in later odes (cf. Farnell 1961: *Pyth.* VI.2), as in *Nem.* X.26 Μούσαισι τ' ἔδωκ' ἄρόσαι; VI.33 Πιερίδων ἄρόταις; cf. *Pyth.* VI.1-3.

12. Cf. Lanata 1963: 81-2; Duchemin 1955: 237ff.

13. The delights which poetry conveys are a commonplace; cf. Hom. *Il.* 9.186, 189, *Od.* 1.347, 8.45, 17.385, Hes. *Th.* 37, 51, 96-103. For Pindar cf. especially *Ol.* I.30-1, XIV.5-6. See further Maehler 1963: 15, 28-9 and Verdenius 1983: 48.

14. The adjective is Homeric e.g. *Il.* 24.303 ὕδωρ... ἀκήρατον; cf. *h. Her.* λειμῶνας ἀκηρασίους. See the very similar development in Ibyc. 5P κῆπος ἀκήρατος, where it is employed as erotic symbol. For the meaning of the word see Nöthiger 1971: 165-6.

15. See Barrett 1992: 171. Cf. S. *Tr.* 200 where ἄτομον ... λειμῶν' indicates a sacred place dedicated to Zeus (see Easterling 1989: *ad loc.*).

16. Cf. Denniston 1954: 193.

The intended meaning is the sense of purity and chastity that Hippolytus maintains, and this becomes clearer in *l.*78 where the personified Αἰδώς is herself said to be the gardener of the sacred “κῆπος”, and to water it with river dews.

The exquisite picture of the ἀκήρατος λειμών symbolises the innate purity and σωφροσύνη that someone must have to gather flowers for a garland, whereas the κακοί (*l.* 81) must be kept away.¹⁷

Aristides achieves an exquisite *encomium* for his honoured pupil. The fusion of both images into a single quotation creates a new powerful aesthetic picture, which functions as a praise referring both to the body and the soul. According to Aristides, such an *encomium* is justified by Apellas' personal characteristics, which are blooming in him at this time of his life, both from those pertaining to his ψυχή and from those pertaining to the σῶμα. Apellas appears to combine harmoniously the attributes suggested by the words of Pindar and Euripides:

a. soul

With the ἀκήρατος Aristides wants to indicate that the young Apellas is a paragon of virtue in the calibre of Hippolytus. The sense of moral purity of Hippolytus is linked with the gentleness and dignity that characterises Apellas' soul¹⁸ and this is clearly depicted in his eyes (cf. §17).

b. body

Apellas' handsomeness is linked with the beauty that Charites bestow to Pindar's poetry. The χάρις that the divine agents give to the song is linked with charismatic appearance of the young boy, whose χάρις has been assigned to him as a gift by the god (cf. §18).

Aristides joins both quotations without saying anything about their original context so that one could expect his audience to identify their authorship and discern the intended associations.

¹⁷. Cf. the interpretation of Barrett 1992: 172.

¹⁸. Some of the old grammarians, according to the Scholia, explained πλεκτὸν στέφανον in a figurative or allegorical sense for a hymn, and ἀκήρατον λειμῶνα for a pure mind. Cf. Schol. Eur. *Hipp. Vita-argumentum* 73: μέλισσαν μέντοι ἀλληγορεῖ αὐτὴν τὴν ψυχὴν. καθαρῶτατον γάρ τι ζῶον ἢ μέλισσα, ... ἐαρινὴν δὲ αὐτὴν εἶπεν ἥτοι ὅτι ἡ μέλισσα ἥδεται τῷ ἔαρι διὰ τὰ ἄνθη ἢ ὅτι αἱ καθαρὰ ψυχὰς αἰεὶ ἐν ἀνθήσει εἰσὶ.

The source for Pind. *Ol.* IX. 26 and Eur. *Hipp.* 73-8

Aristides quotes two more extracts from *Ol.* IX, in his “*defence of oratory*”, a speech contemporary with *Or.* XXX (dated to the same period, Cathedra AD 145-147). The explicit acknowledgement of the natural sequence of *ll.* 27-9 just before *ll.* 100-2 shows that he had a direct acquaintance with the text of *Ol.* IX.¹⁹ If we count also the preceding *l.* 26, then it seems possible that Aristides had studied *Ol.* IX. from an original edition of Pindar.

However, the poetic image of *Ol.* IX.26, and the proverbial character of *ll.* 27-9, suggest the possibility that they were taken from an anthology, or Aristides himself made these excerpts in his study of the ode.

About eighty lines of *Hippolytus* are cited in ancient anthologies, which in their majority are γνῶμαι. Lines 75-81 are quoted by the anthologist Orion (5th cent AD), whereas *ll.* 75-6 are quoted from Plutarch's *non posse suaviter vivi* 1094A. The extract from *Hippolytus* was popular both with the public and the schoolmaster and presumably was excerpted from a complete edition.²⁰ Passages from *Hippolytus* are included in two papyrus anthologies of the 2nd cent BC (P. Ber. 9772 and P. Ber. 9773). Both contain quotations from various authors on the vices and virtues of women.

All these make a strong case that by the time of the second sophistic movement *Hipp.* 73-8 was widely known from various anthologies apart from the direct transmission of Euripides' text. Aristides seems to follow the same tradition;²¹ thus quoting Euripides' lines not from a fuller text but from an anthology which evidently must have contained a much shorter portion of text, he misinterprets the meaning of ἀκήρατος, taking it to mean

¹⁹. Cf. the discussion of the possible source for *Ol.* IX.100-2 on p.181.

²⁰. Cf. Barrett 1992: 82.

²¹. In the present oration one more phrase is cited from Eur. *Heracl.* 178, where in §7 Aristides calls Apellas – in a language similar to that of §16 –, “the offshoot of this land” whose flower is ever blooming. The reference is to the story of Heracles' struggle against the Titans who are qualified as τοῖσι γῆς βλαστήμασιν. The phrase was used metaphorically for ‘offspring’, ‘offshoot’ both from Euripides himself (*Ion* 267), and other authors (*Trag. Adesp.*, fr. 129.1 ὦ χρυσὲ βλάστημα χθονός; also in later prose Jul. *Or.* 7. 22.41 [232d]; schol. Eur. *Vita argumentum* schPh; Basil. *Constitut. ascet.* [Sp.] vol.31. 1357), for which is logical to assume that it was also included as a tragic γνῶμη in an anthology.

gentle (πραῖον). The different interpretation given by Aristides can easily be understood as the result of his reading the passage out of context.

II.3 QUOTATIONS IN PRAISE OF ANCIENT CITIES

II.3.1 The Dithyramb <ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣ Γ'>, Fr.76.

Few fragments of Greek poetry have been quoted and paraphrased in ancient literature as frequently as Pindar's dithyramb for <ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣ Γ'>. From its earliest mention, in Aristophanes' *Knights* (424 BC), down to the quotation “Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα” in Eustathius in the XII cent. of our era, there are no less than 31 references to it, and the manner in which many of these are made suggests that the beginning of the dithyramb may have become proverbial soon after Pindar wrote it and remained so throughout antiquity.

Aristides' testimony emerges as interesting in illustrating the literary exploitation of this standardised piece of praise in various contexts as well as its flexibility in use in rhetorical practice. Aristides evokes no less than five times the expression [Ἑλλάδος] ἔρεισμα in *Ors.* I, VIII, XX, as a compliment for Athens and Smyrna; in two of them (*Or.* I.9 and 124), he gives a spelling variant changing into ἔρυμα. There is also a pointed echo of ἔρεισμα in *Or.* XXIII, where the word is further employed in a metaphorical sense qualifying contemporary sophists.

II.3.1 Aristid. 1, 401 (1, 136 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr. 76.

Introduction to *Or.* I (XIII D.) ΠΑΝΑΘΗΝΑΙΚΟΣ

Aristides in the course of his second trip to Greece and Rome delivered his *Παναθηναϊκός* at the Panathenaea in August AD 155. The speech provides a potted history of classical Athens, which subsequent generations came to regard as Aristides' masterpiece for the purity of its Attic diction.¹

Aristides' context

The purpose of an epilogue in a panegyric speech on behalf of various cities, is to give a final good impression to the audience, which Aristides achieves with a number of poetic turns.² The last lines contain literary elements which show Aristides' virtuosity in handling poetry and prose for impressing his audience. The paragraph 401 epitomises the most striking and flattering expressions of praise ever bestowed on Athens, causing a general admiration. Aristides characteristically tells us that the speech has been fashioned

¹. It earned popularity in ancient schools and was used as schoolbook in Byzantine times: see *OCD* s.v. Aristides (s). Cf. Behr 1968a: 87-8.

². For the historical sources of *Or.* I, cf. Beecke 1908: 125-7 and Haury: 1888.

like the robe <πέπλος> of Athens, as an adornment for the festival of the Panathenaea (§404).

I. (XIII D.) ΠΑΝΑΘΗΝΑΙΚΟΣ.

399 φανερά δὲ καὶ ἡ παρ' αὐτῶν τῶν |
θεῶν εὐνοία καὶ ψῆφος καὶ διὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ μάντεως καὶ ἐξηγητοῦ τοῦ |
πατρῴου τῇ πόλει θύειν τε ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὴν προηροσίαν κελεύον· |
των καὶ μητρόπολιν τῶν καρπῶν αὐτὴν ἐπονομαζόντων, ἔτι δὲ στεφανη- 15
φορεῖν ἀξιούντων, ὥς διὰ βίου νικῶσαν. ἀετόν τε ἐν νεφέλαις αὐτὴν | ὁ θεὸς
400 καλεῖ πρὸς ἄλλα πολίσματα. μόνῃ δ', ὥς ἔοικε, ταύτῃ πόλεων | δύο
τάναντία συμβέβηκεν. πλεῖστά τε γὰρ καὶ κάλλιστα ἀνθρώποις | εἴρηται περὶ
ταύτης, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἥτις ἐλαττόνων τετύχηκεν. πρὸ μὲν | γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων
401 τεθαύμασται, ἄξιον δ' αὐτῆς οὐδὲν ἤκουσεν. πρότερον | μὲν οὖν ἡγάμην 20
ἀκούων τὸ τῆς σοφίας πρυτανεῖον καὶ τὴν τῆς Ἑλλάδος | ἐστίαν καὶ τὸ
ἔρεισμα καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἤδετο, νῦν δέ μοι | δοκεῖ πάντα 1
ταῦτα εἶσω πίπτειν. ἀλλ' εἴ τινα χρὴ πόλιν θεῶν ὑπαρχον | ἢ συγγενῇ
προσειπεῖν ἢ τῆς φύσεως τῆς ἀνθρωπείας εἰκόνα καὶ ὄρον, | ἢ δ' ἂν μοι δοκεῖ
δικαίως κληθῆναι.

(Aristid. 1,399-401 (1,136-7 L.-B.))

This part of the speech is an eulogy on Athens' beauty and intellectual leadership. Aristides has painted a picture of Athens as a whole cultural organisation extolling its contribution to every area of Greek life.

The point is illustrated with the most sophisticated and memorable expressions that appealed to Athenians themselves.

Although Aristides was gratified to hear that Athens was praised as:

- σοφίας πρυτανεῖον (Pl. *Prt.* 337d),³
- Ἑλλάδος ἐστίαν (: an oracular response to the Lacedaemonians; cf. schol. *ad loc.*),⁴
- ἔρεισμα (Pind. *fr.* 76.2),⁵

he feels that all these appreciative words are inadequate for Athens.

Aristides probably expected his audience to recognise the authorship of each of his quotations, which is intentionally concealed.

³. Cf. Ath. 187d τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν, τὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος μουσεῖον, ἣν ὁ μὲν Πίνδαρος Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα ἔφη, Θουκυδίδης δ' ἐν τῷ εἰς Εὐριπίδην ἐπιγράμματι Ἑλλάδος Ἑλλάδα, ὁ δὲ Πύθιος ἐστίαν καὶ πρυτανεῖον τῶν Ἑλλήνων.

⁴. Cf. also §§14, 30, 61 and schol. Aristid. 3,30 Dind. διὰ τὸ πρεσβυτάτην εἶναι τὴν πόλιν.

⁵. Cf. Isoc. XV.166.

From Pindar's dithyramb to Athens, Aristides' chooses to quote only one word ἔρεισμα, which expresses the spirit of the Athenian society. The word itself appealed to emotions rather than to reason, since it had a special connotation for every Athenian, depicting Athens' role in the Persian Wars.

Pindar *Fr.76*⁶

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣ (Γ' cl. fr.74 et 75, 8?)

- ⊗ Ὅ ται λιπαραὶ καὶ ἰοστέφανοι καὶ ἀοίδιμοι,
'Ελλάδος ἔρει-
σμα, κλειναὶ Ἀθᾶναι, δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον.

No poet before Pindar described Athens with such brilliance.⁷ The indirect tradition identifies it as a *dithyramb*.⁸ It is a compliment to the Athenians' leadership in the defeat of Persian invasion. These lines are presumed by most recent editors and scholars to be from the same *dithyramb* as *fr. 77*, on the basis of intrinsic evidence.⁹

The word ἔρεισμα in its literal sense suggests “*the bulwark, support*” of Greece.¹⁰ The Athenians were so gratified to be called ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος, that they recompensed Pindar with double the amount of the fine imposed by his native Thebans.¹¹

⁶ *Fr. 76* was recovered by the combined evidence of Aristid. *Or.* I.401, the scholia *ad loc.* as well as the evidence from Ar. *Eq.* 1329; schol. *Ach.* 637, 674, schol. *Nu.* 299; Plut. *glor. Ath.* 7p. 350A; and Call. *fr.7.29Pf.*

⁷ Meyer (1933: 57-8), thinks that the preserved lines should be considered as opening.

⁸ Cf. schol. Ar. *Ach.* 637 ἰοστέφανους· παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν Πινδάρου διθυράμβων·

⁹ Plutarch (*glor. Athen.* 7p. 349C-350A) quotes first *fr.78*, then *fr.77* and between them preserves some words from *fr.76*. This led scholars to believe that all these fragments probably belong to one poem. On the other hand, one could argue that *frs.76&77* are not closely related to *fr.78* in the text of Plutarch. I think that the connection of *frs.76&77* is further supported by scholia on *Or.* III (3,600Dind.), where portion of both *frs.* are quoted together: *fr.77* “κρηπίδα τῆς ἐλευθερίας” and *fr.76* “ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος εἶπε τὰς Ἀθῆνας ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος”. This might be an indication that the scholiast had read them as parts of the same poem.

¹⁰ van der Weiden (1991: 212), translates “the prop, stay”. Pindar in *Ol.* II.6 addresses Theron as ἔρεισμα of Acragas; cf. Herodotus' similar tribute to Athens 7.139 σωτήρας τῆς Ἑλλάδος.

¹¹ See *Vita Ambr.* (1,1,16 Drach.); *Vita Thomana* (1.5.17 Drach.); cf. also Aeschin. *Ep.* 4,2; Eust. *Proem.* 3, 300, 9Drach. The lives of Pindar contain a number of anecdotes that have little or no historic value. However, this story gained considerable currency in antiquity and it may have had some historical basis (as it has been suggested by Wilamowitz 1922: 273; Race 1986: 3 and recently by van der Weiden 1991: 209). The anecdote attempts to explain why a Theban poet, whose native city fought on the Persian side during the war, would praise Athens for its victory. There are of course other versions, all to the same general effect: according to Isoc. 15 *Antid.* 166, Pindar was honoured by the Athenians with his appointment as πρόξενος and with a gift of ten thousand drachmas (probably a rhetorical exaggeration); according to Paus. 1, 8, 4 a statue of him was set up in the Agora (see Aeschin. *Ep.* 4,2). The detail of the fine at Thebes is added in the later accounts in the lives.

From the fame of this passage 'Ελλάδος ἔρεισμα became a cliché and it is probable that Aristides knew it as an apophthegm extensively used in oratory and public speeches.¹²

He obviously employs the word in its original sense, and in combination with other similar exultant characterisations in favour of Athens:

(401) “Formerly I heard with admiration, ‘town hall of Knowledge’ and the ‘hearth of Greece’, and ‘its bulwark’, and all such things which were sung in praise of the city...”.

There are two reasons for classifying Aristides' language as poetic:

1. The expression σοφίας πρυτανεῖον is a metaphor for poetry, which Aristides took from Plato (*Prt.* 337d). Plato used a poetic source; probably he cited it from the lost part of Pindar's dithyramb.

2. When Aristides says that all these praises *were sung* (ἦδετο) in honour of Athens, this suggests poetry.

Aristides, in an imaginary speech “Πρὸς Ἀθηναίους Εἰρήνην”, quotes Pindar's 'Ελλάδος ἔρεισμα, employing the same verb (ἦδομεν).

VIII. (XXXII D.) ΥΠΕΡ ΤΗΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΥΣ ΕΙΡΗΝΗΣ.

21 μηδαμῶς, |
 ὦ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, μὴ τοὺς βαρβάρους μιμώμεθα, μηδ', ἦν ἔρεισμα |
 τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλιν ἦδομεν, ταύτην ἀνατρέψωμεν, μηδ' ὑποσπᾶσθωμεν |
 μηδ' ἐκκόψωμεν τῆς Ἑλλάδος τοῖν ὀφθαλμοῖν τὸν ἕτερον, ἀλλ' ἀνα- | 20
 μνησθέντες ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας.... ἐν καιρῷ νῦν τὴν| χάριν αὐτοῖς ἀπόδοτε, 1
 (Aristid. 8,21 (1,622-3 L.-B.))

A Lacedaemonian addressing the assembly, invites his fellow-citizens and the allies to show gratitude and not overthrow Athens, which was sung of as ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος.¹³

¹². Aeschin. *Ep.* 4,2Blass: ἐν γοῦν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις Μελανώπου ἐκάστοτε ἀκούεις λέγοντος, ὦ ταῖ λιπαραὶ καὶ ἀοίδιμοι Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμ' Ἀθᾶναι'.

¹³. It is a rhetorical exercise and the historical background is known from X. *HG* II.2.19ff, referring to when Athens was reduced to surrender by Lysander.

Pindar's dithyramb was used in Athens' schools between 450 and 420 BC, as a kind of “γύμνασμα” which the pupils had to learn by heart.¹⁴ Pindar's words were generally considered by Athenians as a kind of “*national anthem*” for their city.

¹⁴. Irigoin (1952: 16), argues for its popularity.

II.3.1 Aristid. 20(21), 2, 20, 14-5K = Pind. Fr. 76.

Introduction to *Or. XX* (21) ΠΑΛΙΝΩΔΙΑ ΕΠΙ ΣΜΥΡΝΗ

Among Aristides' extant works there are five speeches –standing in chronological order as originally published¹⁵ – concerning the city of Smyrna¹⁶. The *Παλινωδία ἐπὶ Σμύρνῃ* is intimately connected –as well as *Ors.* XVIII and XIX– to the earthquake and its aftermath, containing references both to the generous response of the emperors to Smyrna's plight and to the process of rebuilding and reconstruction. Aristides sent this speech from Laneion to the Provincial Assembly in Smyrna to celebrate the rebuilding of the city.¹⁷

Aristides' context

Considering the circumstances prevailing in Smyrna after the earthquake, Aristides claims that it is improper for his fellow–citizens to feel ashamed of their city. He illustrates his views by comparing the corresponding situation in Athens during its misfortunes. Athens' image emerges as a city suffering from civil and political convulsions. It has been deprived of its whole empire, walls and ships, and its population had reached the point where they were forced into exile.¹⁸

XX. (21) ΠΑΛΙΝΩΔΙΑ ΕΠΙ ΣΜΥΡΝΗ.

13 ἐκείνοις |
τοίνυν στερηθεῖσι μὲν τῶν νεῶν, στερηθεῖσι δὲ τῶν τειχῶν καὶ | τῆς ἀρχῆς 10
ὅλης καὶ προελθοῦσιν εἰς τοῦτο ὥστε τὸν δῆμον φυγάδα | ἀναγκασθῆναι τῆς
πατρίδος γενέσθαι — τὰ γὰρ ἐν μέσῳ τοσαῦτα | σιωπήσομαι—, ἀλλ' οὕτω
γε πράξασι, πλὴν Φαρσάλου τε καὶ Ἄρ|γους καὶ Θηβῶν, οὐδένες οὔτε
μείζονα οὔτε ἐλάττονα ἀπεμνημόνευ|σαν χάριν τῶν ἐκ τοῦ παντὸς αἰῶνος
εὐεργεσιῶν, οὐδ' ὅτι τοῦ γένους | ἔρεισμα ἢ πόλις ἦδετο (Pind. frg. 76 B⁴). 15
οὔτοι δὲ οὕς εἶπον τοὺς | τε φεύγοντας δεξάμενοι καὶ τοῖς ἐξαιτοῦσιν
ἀντισχόντες ταύτην δὴ | χάριν τῇ πάντα ὑπερφερούση πόλει κατέθεντο,
παρ' ἣ τὴν ἀγαθὴν | ἰδρῦσθαι τύχην αἱ μαντεῖαι λέγουσι.

(Aristid. 20 (21) 2,20,14-5 K).

¹⁵. Cf. Burton 1992: 444.

¹⁶. *Ors.* XVII-XXI.

¹⁷. The Assembly met here this year, cf. Behr 1968a: 112-3.

¹⁸. Aristides alludes to the exile of “δῆμος” after the establishment of the ‘Thirty’; cf. Behr *Aristides* 1986: vol.I. 461 n.12.

Aristides, almost 23 years after his *Παναθηναϊκός*, quotes the word *ἔρεισμα* in his *Παλινωδία ἐπὶ Σμύρνην* objecting to the (ungrateful) attitude of the Greeks, who should provide Athenians with assistance on the ground that Athens was standing as a “*bulwark of the race*” in the Greek world.

Pindar's *ἔρεισμα* is used as part of his argument; he assumes it to be the ultimate praise ever bestowed on Athens.

As regards the real value of his quotation, Aristides did not keep the original reading *Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα*, but he replaced [τῆς Ἑλλάδος] with τοῦ γένους *ἔρεισμα*; a more comprehensive term. He wants to emphasise the role of Athens acting on behalf of all the Greek cities and offering its generosity. The word “γένος” has a broader sense and its meaning is not restricted to certain geographical boundaries but it means the Greek race in general, which enhances more the glamour of Athens. The rhetorical exploitation of Pindar's words in a declamation in praise of Smyrna gives to the quotation a wider sense: presumably the change to γένους also admits Smyrna into the same category as Athens.

II.3.1 Aristid. 1, 9 (1, 11 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr 76.

I. (XIII D.) ΠΑΝΑΘΗΝΑΙΚΟΣ.

9 πρόκειται (sc. Attica) γὰρ ἀντ' ἄλλου φυλακτηρίου τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὴν |
γιγνομένην τάξιν ἔχουσα πρῶτην πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα, προμήκης εἰς τὸ | 5
πέλαγος, καὶ μάλα ἐναργῆς συμβαλεῖν, ὅτι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐστὶν ἔρυμα | ὑπὸ
τῶν κρειττόνων πεπονημένον, καὶ μόνη ταύτη κατὰ φύσιν ἐστὶν | ἡγεῖσθαι
τοῦ γένους.

(Aristid. 1,9 (1,11 L.-B.))

Aristides' context

Aristides, having spoken in the preceding paragraphs of the Athenians' philanthropy (φιλανθρωπίαν), praises the qualities of the geographical position of their country. He extols Attica as the means of “protection” for Greece, which has been favoured by the gods as being the ἔρυμα¹⁹ of the country, in the sense of “safeguard or defence” (cf. LSJ s.v. ἔρυμα).²⁰

The same praise also attributed to Athens, occurs further down in §124. It was only Athens which displayed its qualities as an ἔρυμα and πρόβολος (shield) on behalf of the whole Greece from the very beginning of Xerxes' invasion.

124 ἡ πόλις δ' ἕτερα ἀντεπεδείκνυνεν, οὐδ' |
ἦν Ξέρξην μᾶλλον θαυμάσαι τῆς ὑπερηφανίας ἢ τὴν πόλιν τοῦ μηδὲν | τῶν
ἐκείνου θαυμάσαι. ἢ θορύβου τοσούτου διὰ γῆς ἀπάσης καταρ|ραγέντος καὶ
τῶν ἡπείρων ἀμφοτέρων κρινομένων ἐπὶ τῆς Ἑλλάδος | ἀντέσχεν ὥσπερ 10
ἔρυμα καὶ πρόβολος, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀρξαμένη καὶ αὐτὴ | τὰ αὐτῆς ἐπιδεικνύναι.

(Aristid. 1,124 (1,52 L.-B.))

Given that the phrase used here twice, Ἑλλάδος... ἔρυμα, sounds strikingly similar to the famous phrase Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα which Aristides quotes no less than three times, one may wonder whether this is a reminiscence of it, possibly a subconscious one.

19. Behs notes in his apparatus: ἔρυμα: v et ex parte μ i. ras. Ba, fuitne ἔρεισμα ?.

20. For a similar metaphorical use cf. ἔρυμα χώρας of the Areopagus, A. Eu. 701; cf. also Eur. Med. 597, 1322; ἔρυμα χθονὸς ὄφρα βάλοιτο Call. Hec. 1.2.8.

Athens' supremacy and sovereignty are denoted and emphasised by Aristides in ἔρυμα. This picture of the leading city is explicitly stressed in the *dithyramb* and particularly in the meaning conveyed by Pindar's ἔρεισμα.

One could argue that Aristides had in mind Pindar's *dithyramb* and inadvertently changed the original ἔρεισμα into ἔρυμα, which – (unattested in Pindar's poetry) – is a reminiscence of the famous Pindaric phrase.²¹

It is perhaps worth asking why Aristides shows a special preference for quoting Pindar instead of Simonides, who was the chief *laudator* of the glories of Athens and Sparta in the struggle with Persia; perhaps the answer is that neither Simonides nor any other poet ever so gratified the ears and the souls of the Athenians or any other people as Pindar did with these inspired words of praise.

The indirect tradition of *Fr.76*

The expression 'Ελλάδος ἔρεισμα is quoted 24 times by various poets, prose writers, orators, scholiasts, and anthologists. A critical examination of the existing testimonies shows that not all the authors have preserved the word ἔρεισμα in their quotations:

I. Authors quoting the word ἔρεισμα in <i>Fr.76</i>		
	<i>Variants</i>	<i>Sources</i>
1	'Ελλάδος ἔρεισμα	Schol. Ar. Nub. 229b; Ath. 5,187d (1p. 418, 7 Kaibel); Eust. 284.4
2	'Ελλάδος ἔρεισμι	Aeschin. Ep. 4,2 Blass
3	τῆς 'Ελλάδος ἔρεισμα	Luc. Dem. Enc. 10
4	ἔρεισματῆς 'Ελλάδος	Plut. Glor. Ath. 7p.350a; Isocr. 15.166; Lib. Decl. 17,26 (VI p. 206, 2 Foerster); Eust. Prooem. 28 (3,300,9 Drach.); Vita Pind. Ambr. (1,1,15 Drach.)
5	'Ελλάδος ἡ πόλις ἔρεισμα	Lib. Decl. 1,79 (V p.57,15 Foerster)
6	ἔρεισμι" Ἀθήνας δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον	Schol. Aristid. 3,341 Dind.(=fuller version)
7	ἔρεισμα τῶν Ἀθηνῶν	Luc. Tim. 50 ; S. OC 58.
8	'Ε[λλάδος] ἔρεισμα Ἀθῆναι	Schol. Call. fr.7. 20-2 Pf. p.19; Plut. Apophth. Lac. p.232E;
9	τὰς Ἀθήνας ἔρεισμα γεγράφηκεν	Tzetzes ad Hes. Op. 412 (Poetae Graeci Minores II 1823 p.269 Gaisford)
10	'Ελλάδος μὲν εἰπεῖν ἔρεισμα μικρόν	Him. Or. 62,2 (p.224,11 Colonna)
11	τῆς 'Ελλάδος ἐστὶν καὶ τὸ ἔρεισμα	Aristid. 1,401 (1,136 L.-B.)

21. Cf. D.H.' remark that the imitator must not say what Demosthenes said but say his own ideas in Demosthenes' fashion; see Rh. X.19,373 καὶ μιμεῖται τὸν Δημοσθένην οὐχ ὁ τὸ <Δημοσθενους λέγων, ἀλλ' ὁ> δημοσθενικῶς, καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν Ὅμηρον, καὶ πᾶσα μίμησις ὧδε ἔχει τέχνης ζῆλος ἐκμάττων ἐνθυμημάτων ὁμοιότητα.

12	ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλιν ἡδομεν	Aristid. 8,21 (1,622-3, L.-B.)
13	τοῦ γένους ἔρεισμα	Aristid. 20 (21) 2,20,15-4 K
14 ?	ὥσπερ ἔρεισμα	Aristid. 23 (42) 2,33,9 K (?)
15	τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἔρυμα	Aristid. 1,9 (1,11 L.-B.)
16	ὥσπερ ἔρυμα καὶ πρόβολος	Aristid. 1,124 (1,52 L.-B.)

II. Authors quoting *Fr.76 without the word ἔρεισμα*

1.	Ar. Eq. 1329
2.	Schol. Ar. Ach. 637
3.	Dionysius Phaselites in Schol. Pyth. 2 nscr.(2,31,14 Drachmann)
4.	Philostr. Im. 2,12,4 (p. 358,25 Kayser; p. 85,19 Senim. Vindobon. Sodales)
5.	Iul. Or. 1,6 (p. 19,22 Bidez)
6.	Damascius, Vita Isidori apud Phot. Bibl. 341b,37 Bekker (Σουπηριανός)
7.	Suda, s.v. Σουπηριανός
8.	Vita Pind. Thomana (1,5,17 Drachmann)

In the above table (1), it appears that 15 authors have preserved the word ἔρεισμα in different variations as a feature of Athens, whereas other eight do not include it preferring to quote only the epithets: λιπαραί, ἰοστέφανοι, αἰδίμοι.

Pindar's ἔρεισμα appealed to Aristides' who in all of his quotations shows a specific preference for it, and creates three new variations. In two of them he combines the ἔρεισμα with the words γένος and ἐστία correspondingly, and in the third one he gives a spelling variant changing into ἔρυμα.²²

The possible source for those authors who quote only ἔρεισμα without giving more text or any other information about the original context must be an anthology, e.g. Plutarch's *apophth. Lac.* 232E Πινδάρου δὲ γράψαντος | Ἑλλάδος ἔρεισμα Ἀθῆναι. The scholion on Aristid. 3,341Dind. and schol. *Nub.* 229b, preserve a fuller version. The former is of special importance in preserving the phrase δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον, otherwise not attested.

“τὸ δὲ ἔρεισμα πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι καὶ Πίνδαρος δέ φησιν, Ἐρεισμ' Ἀθήνας δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον”.²³

²². Aristides also used ἔρεισμα in a different context in *Or.* XXIII.5 censuring the frivolous attitude of some contemporary sophists: ἡπιστάμην μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῦτο ὥσπερ ἔρεισμα πολλοῖς ὄν καὶ κατὰ φυγὴν τὸ τοῦ παρόντος ἐπαινεῖν ἀεὶ καὶ ἐν οἷς ἂν λέγωσιν... Pindar also used ἔρεισμα to qualify individuals: e.g. *Ol.* II.6 (: Theron). By that time the original metaphor ἔρεισμα had changed its meaning to “prop”, “refuge”.

²³. With πολλοὶ and ἄλλοι the scholiast means those who quote the *fr.* 76.

In the majority of the testimonies Pindar's authorship of these lines is directly attested. 21 of them ascribe the fragment to Pindar by mentioning his name next to the word ἔπειμα; whilst only five do not state its authorship, among them is Aristides.

This was a Pindaric phrase of which Aristides was especially fond. At a time when Smyrna was in need of renewed recognition, after its devastation, Aristides offers the consolation of a glorious comparison between it and Athens (§§12-3), by comparing the two cities as similarly glorious which however did in their long history suffer many calamities.

II.3.2 Aristid. 17(15), 2, 1, 20-1K = Pind. Ol. I. 38-9.

Introduction to *Or. XVII ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΚΟΣ [ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΣ]*.

In this lovely little oration – conjecturally dated to March of AD 157¹ – Aristides gives one of the best descriptions of ancient Smyrna which we possess from the whole literature of the late antiquity. The method that Aristides follows in presenting matters from the history of the city, its population, geography and sights, is ingenious.

The present oration was delivered in honour of the arrival of the governor of Asia at the assizes in Smyrna. The recipient was identified by Behr as P. Cluvius Maximus Paullinus.²

Aristides' context

Aristides' praise of important cities is always supported by references to the poets who praised and connected them to various myths. In an ornate style the orator presents the three successive stages (πρεσβυτάτη, δευτέρα and τρίτω), that Smyrna had undergone in reaching the modern state.³ The first and the last stage are very elaborately illustrated with allusions and quotations from the poets. In a Pindaric manner Aristides attempts a connection of ancient Smyrna with local myths. According to his reasoning the most ancient city (πρεσβυτάτη) was founded on the [mountain] Sipylos,⁴ which is illustrated with references to the poetry of Homer and Pindar. In both cases Aristides preserves the poet's words in paraphrase. In *Iliad*, book 24.615, the Sipylos is described as:

ἐν Σιπύλῳ, ὅθι φασὶ θεάων ἔμμεναι εὐνὰς | νυμφάων.

The meaning of the verse remains unchanged in Aristides' paraphrase. In order to illustrate the importance of the Sipylos as a place beloved by the gods from its beginning, Aristides resorts to *Olympian I*.

¹. Cf. Behr 1968a: 91, *id*, Aristides 1981: vol.II. 357 n.1. For an opposite view see Boulanger 1923: 162, who being under the impression that *Ors.* XVII and XXI were delivered to Marcus and Commodus dated the present oration in AD 176; Pack (1947: 19), follows Boulanger's view.

². Cf. Behr 1968a: 91-2. He rightly refutes the argument that the recipient was the Emperor Marcus Aurelius on the grounds that *Or.* XXI.7 concerns this man's son.

³. The whole process of development is compared to statues and carefully written compositions that have undergone a second and a third hand.

⁴. In Aristides' context Sipylos appears to be the mountain on which the first city of Smyrna was built. It was the continuation of mount Tmolos towards Smyrna. However, it was also regarded as the city of Tantalus cf. schol. *Ol.* 62a οἱ μὲν πόλεως ὄνομα, οἱ δὲ ὄρους περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν.

Pindar OL. I. 38-9

After a series of maxims, the introduction of Pelops' story is emphasised by a striking correction of the traditional story.⁵ Pindar states the place and the circumstance of the mythical incident:

OLYMPIA I (476)

⁹ ἐς ἔρανον φίλαν τε Σίπυλον, 38
 ἀμοιβαῖα θεοῖσι δεῖπνα παρέχων,
 (OL. I.38-9).

Aristides, as usual, paraphrases this passage after his reference to Homer.

XVII. (15) ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΚΟΣ [ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΣ].

2 Ἔστι γὰρ οὐ | 10
 νεωστὶ ἡμῖν ἡ πόλις εὐτυχής, ἀλλ' ἐκ προγόνων, καὶ καθέστηκεν αὐτὴ | πρὸς
 αὐτὴν ἐν ἀποίκου σχήματι καὶ μητροπόλεως· τρίτη γὰρ ἐστὶν | ἀπὸ τῆς
 ἀρχαίας· ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ οἱ δι' ἀκριβείας | λόγοι δευτέρᾳ καὶ
 τρίτῃ χειρὶ καθίστανται, οὕτως ἄρα καὶ τὴν | πόλιν τρίτῃ χειρὶ χρῆν 15
 κτισθεῖσαν ἀκριβῶσαι τὸ κάλλος, καὶ | γέγονεν δὴ παλαιότατη <καὶ>
 καινοτάτη ἢ αὐτὴ ἑαυτὴν ἀνανεω|σαμένη, καθάπερ τὸν ὄρνιν φασὶ τὸν
 3 ἱερόν. ἡ μὲν οὖν πρεσβυτάτη | πόλις ἐν τῷ Σιπύλῳ κτίζεται, οὐ δὲ τὰς τε
 θεῶν εὐνὰς εἶναι | λέγουσιν καὶ τοὺς Κουρήτων χοροὺς περὶ τὴν τοῦ Διὸς
 μητέρα. | οὕτω δ' ἦν ἐξ ἀρχῆς θεοφιλὴς ὥστε λέγουσιν οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς 20
 | θεοὺς ἅμα τοῖς ἥρωσιν ἐρανίζειν εἰς αὐτὴν ἀναμῖξ εὐωχουμένους. |
 ἐκείνην μὲν οὖν αἱ νύμφαι δέχονται, καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν ὕφαλος ὑπελ|βοῦσα τὴν 1
 4 λίμνην, ὥς φασιν. δευτέρα δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα ὤκεῖτο ὑπὸ | τῷ Σιπύλῳ παρὰ
 τὴν χηλὴν τῆς ἡϊόνος, ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ἀρχαίας καὶ | τῆς νῦν, ἢ νῦν ἀρχαία πρὸς
 ταύτην καθεστηκυῖα· ταῦτα δ' ἦν ὥσπερ | μελέται τῆσδε τῆς οἰκίσεως ἐν 5
 ἄλλοις φαυλοτέροις πλάσμασιν. | τρίτῳ δέ, ὥς οἱ ποιηταὶ καλοῦσιν, βήματι
 κινήθεισα ἡ πόλις εἰς | ἐν τῷδε κατέστη τὸ σχῆμα.

(Aristid. 17 (15) 2,1-2,20-1 K).

In Aristides' paraphrase Sipylos is called ἐξ ἀρχῆς θεοφιλὴς. This can be understood as a connection of Pindar's φίλαν (l. 38) and θεοῖσι (l. 39). Pindar often

⁵. For earlier versions of the myth cf. Howie 1983: 278ff.

refers to a victor or to a city as a friend (cf., *Pyth.* I.92, *Ol.* IX.21).⁶ In Homer φίλος is an equivalent of a direct reflexive pronoun, cf., *Il.* 7.130 φίλας ἀνὰ χεῖρας αἰείραι, *Od.* 5.461-62 αἶψα δ' ἄρ' Ἴνῳ δέξατο χερσὶ φίλησιν.⁷ The adjective φίλος is not used here (*Ol.* I.38) as a reflexive possessive pronoun (as at *Ol.* I.4) as claimed by Landfester,⁸ comparing ἐὰν πόλιν in *Ol.* X.38 and πόλιος ...φίλας in *Nem.* VIII.13, but the context as Gerber argues, “leads us to expect something more than a colourless ‘his’”. The surface meaning according to him is ‘dear (to Tantalus)’.⁹

Aristides interpreting the Pindaric φίλαν, gives the meaning ‘dear (to the gods)’. The ancient Sipylos was dear to the divine guests of Tantalus. This interpretation is further emphasised by the preceding quotation from *Il.* 24.615 about the privilege that the Sipylos was granted by the Gods. Pindar's words in Aristides' paraphrase acquire a slightly different meaning because he wants to formulate an additional compliment to Smyrna. He has in his mind the words of Pindar which he adapts freely in his praise for the city.

The Pindaric ἐς ἔρانون is replaced with the infinitive ἐρανίζειν to which Aristides supplies θεοὺς and ἥρωσιν as subjects. According to Aristides' interpretation, the poets maintain that “*the gods and the heroes assemble in it when they feast together*”. Vondeling states that the essential meaning of the Pindaric word ἔρανος is “*service which is service in return or expects a service in return*”.¹⁰ Therefore, in this respect, the intended meaning of the word is interpreted correctly by Aristides. The intended sense of reciprocity that involves the meal to which Tantalus has invited the gods in return (cf. *Il.*

⁶ **Kambylis** (1964: 159), remarks that Pindar in addressing someone as φίλος “*gibt damit sein freundschaftliches Verhältnis zu diesem kund*”.

⁷ **Benveniste's** contention (1974: vol.I. 338-53 = Engl. ed.: 275-88), that the epic use of φίλος always has an emotional overtone and is never simply an equivalent of a possessive pronoun is refuted by **Landfester** (1966: 13-34). Pindar uses φίλος in this sense with parts of the body or like at *Ol.* I.4 φίλον ἦτορ, and *Pyth.* III.61 φίλα ψυχά. At *Pae.* VI.12 ἦτορι ... φίλω, **Radt** (1958: *ad loc.*), argues that the meaning is “friendly”. Cf. also the article by **Hooker** 1987: 44-65.

⁸ **Landfester** 1966: 48. His discussion of Pindaric use elsewhere (cf. *Pyth.* IV.1), is not always satisfactory; from his exx. in p.46 n.10 only *Pyth.* XII.18 is certain.

⁹ See **Gerber** 1982: 75 φίλαν. He also argues that a second meaning ‘dear (to the gods)’ is also intended. This view is further supported by **Verdenius** 1988: *ad loc.* For places in Homer that are ‘dear (to the gods)’ cf. *Il.* 4.51 and *Od.* 8.284. Cf. **Slater** s.v. φίλος 1a: “*welcome, dear, well-loved*”.

¹⁰ **Vondeling** 1961: 262.

62-4), is preserved in Aristides' paraphrase as ἐρανίζειν εἰς αὐτὴν ἀναμῖξ εὐωχομένους.¹¹

Aristides' paraphrase shows a similarity with the corresponding scholion *Ol.* I.40a:¹²

ὥς οἱ θεοὶ ἐπὶ ἐστίαν ἐκάλεσαν τὸν Τάνταλον εἰς ἔρανον ὃ ἐστὶ τὴν
εὐωχίαν παρασκευάσαντες (ABCDEQ).

(ἐστίασιν *Drach.*, who deletes [εἰς] and [ὃ ἐστὶ τὴν εὐωχίαν]).¹³

The gruesome overtones in Pindar's *l.* 39 disappear in Aristides' choice of the words. This is another example of Aristides' intention to adapt Pindar to his purpose. The Pindaric words in the context of the Smyranean oration (1) are intended as the most appropriate praise to the ancient city, especially in illustrating its relation to the Gods.

¹¹. **Gerber** (1982: 74-5), observes that the use of the word up to Eur. *Sup.* 363, indicates a reciprocity in the meal; the word in its later use presupposes that the participants bring their own contribution. The word in Aristides' context seems to reflect the Pindaric meaning as we can judge from the ἀναμῖξ εὐωχομένους which is the paraphrase of Pindar's *l.* 39 ἀμοιβαῖα θεοῖσι δεῖπνα παρέχων.

¹². On this scholion cf. also p.157.

¹³. The text presents problems: εἰς ἔρανον looks like an alternative to ἐπὶ ἐστίαν (ἐστίασιν *Drachmann*). Perhaps this scholion had been conflated from two phrases in separate commentaries, before somebody added παρασκευάσαντες in order to provide a verb for ἔρανον.

II.3.2 Aristid. 21(22), 2, 26, 4-7K = Pind. Ol. I. 26-7, 49.

Introduction to *Or. XXI ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΚΟΣ [ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΗΤΙΚΟΣ]*.

This oration comes from the last part of the orator's active career and it was composed in Laneion, his estate in Mysia.¹⁴ Behr claims that the recipient of this speech was possibly the son of P. Cluvius Maximus Paullinus, the recipient of *oration* XVII.¹⁵

In March, AD 179, when the rebuilding of Smyrna was essentially completed, the son and former legate of P. Cluvius Maximus Paullinus, entered Smyrna as governor in his own right for the assizes.¹⁶

This *oration* shows some affinity to *Or. XVII Σμυρναϊκός [πολιτικός]*. Aristides now twenty-two years later, echoes the themes he developed in *Or. XVII*, when the father - like the son now - entered the city as governor.¹⁷

Aristides' context

Or. XXI gives in paraphrase the story of Pelops as a *mythical parallel* to Smyrna. Aristides attempts a connection of the city's fortune with the story of Pelops (cf. *Ors.* XXI.3; 10 with XVIII.2), which is a very suitable subject since he was considered as its first founder. The rhetorical aim is the gratification of the population of Smyrna. Everyone knew the treatment of the myth by Pindar and by adding such a familiar parallel Aristides equates Smyrna's fortune to that of Pelops. The reasoning is that, as Pelops obtained beauty through his suffering, so Smyrna became better than ever as if Poseidon had shaken his trident intentionally.

In this oration Aristides reproduces the material and the themes that he developed in *Or. XVII* when he portrayed the image of Smyrna before the earthquake.¹⁸

¹⁴. From Laneion Aristides composes all his orations concerning the city of Smyrna - except *Or. XVII* composed in the city itself. The image of the city after the earthquake of AD 178 is predominant in all of them.

¹⁵. Behr 1968a: 92 n.1a. Note also that Menander Rhetor classifies speeches to visiting governors as one of three categories of 'speeches of arrival' *λόγοι ἐπιβατήριοι* (Spengel, 377ff.).

¹⁶. Cf. the detailed discussion of various views suggested in Burton 1992: 444-7.

¹⁷. We note in particular the handling of the topics in §§3-4, which have been treated in *Or. XVII*, but not precisely in the form in which it is implied.

¹⁸. Behr (*Aristides* 1981: vol.II. 362 n.1), suggests that Aristides in *Or. XXI* copies in a loose way, as if he were writing from memory without consulting the original. This seems probable if we take into consideration the fact the Aristides was prescribed by the god to memorise speeches he composed as part of his cure.

The reiteration concerns mainly the mythic founders of the city, the new image of the city that is now better than ever before. There is also a literal repetition of the praise (cf. *Ors.* XVII.3 with XVIII.2, cf. also XXI.3 with XVIII.2).

The structure of Aristides' praise to Smyrna consists mainly of three stages:

1. The fortune of Smyrna is paralleled to Pelops (§10).
2. The city is an example of beauty having surpassed even itself (§11).¹⁹
3. The fortune of the city is likened to that of metropolis (§11-2).²⁰

XXI. (22) ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΚΟΣ [ΠΡΟΣΦΩΝΗΤΙΚΟΣ].

9 καὶ μὴν τήν γε |
 εὐγένειαν τοῦ δήμου — μὴ γὰρ πάνθ' ἡμῖν ἔστω περὶ τῶν οἰκοδομημάτων 15
 — τίς οὐκ ἂν ἠγάσθη καὶ ἐθαύμασεν; οὔτε γὰρ ἐξεπλάγη | πρὸς τὴν
 συμφορὰν, παραμυθίαν τε οὐκ ἐζήτησεν οὐδ' ἀνέμεινεν | καλλίῳ τῆς παρὰ
 τῶν βασιλέων ἅμα ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ γιγνομένης, | ὥστε ὁ τοῦ πένθους αὐτῷ
 10 καιρὸς ἐορτὴ τις ἐγεγόνει. Καὶ μὴν | τὰ γ' ἐπὶ τούτοις ἡμεῖς μὲν ἀκοῇ 1
 γιγνώσκομεν, σὺ δ' ὁρῶν | κἂν ἑτέροις αὐτὸς ἐξηγοῖο. ἔοικε γὰρ οὐ πόρρῳ
 πεπραγένοι τοῦ | μυθολογήματος ἢ πόλις τοῦ περὶ τὸν ἀρχηγέτην αὐτῇ
 λεχθέντος. | οἷσθ' ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸν Πέλοπα κατὰ μέλη 5
 τμηθέντα ἐψηθέντα ἐν λέβητι συντεθῆναι πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ τοῦ 5
 λέβητος, ἐλλείποντος δὲ τοῦ ὥμου σχεῖν ἐλεφάντινον ἀντὶ τοῦ
 παλαιοῦ, καὶ φασὶ | τὸ ἔργον Δήμητρος γενέσθαι· ὥς δὲ καὶ τῇ πόλει
 μετ' ἐκείνον τὸν | λέβητα, ὃς αὐτῇ πάντα ἐπέφλεξεν, ἡ δευτέρα σύστασις εἰς
 θαυμαστήν τινα ἐλήλυθε κάλλους περιουσίαν, ὥσπερ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος |
 ἐξεπίτηδες τῇ τριαίνῃ κινήσαντος αὐτήν, ἵν' ἴδοι καλλίονα ἢ πρὸ | τοῦ· οἷόν 10
 τι καὶ περὶ Θετταλίαν λέγεται φιλανθρωπεύσασθαι τὴν | διασφάγα ποιήσας
 11 τῶν Τεμπῶν ἕνεκα τῷ Πηνειῷ. καὶ γὰρ τοι | πρότερον μὲν οὐδ' εἰς ἐπίνοιαν
 ὑπερβολῆς ἐλθεῖν ἦν, ἀλλ' ἐδόκει | παράδειγμα κάλλους ἢ πόλις εἶναι, νυνὶ δ'
 ἐξηλέγχθημεν ἄρα οὐκ | ὀρθῶς δοξάζοντες. τότε μὲν γὰρ τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις, 15
 νῦν δ' αὐτὴ | σχεδὸν ὥς εἰπεῖν ἑαυτὴν νενίκηκεν· καὶ μοι δοκεῖ προσόμοιον τῇ
 | μητροπόλει παθεῖν. μνησθήσομαι δ' εἰκόνος οὐ μυθώδους, ἀλλ' | ἀναγκαίας
 12 πιστεῦσαι. ἐκείνη τε γὰρ ἐμπρησθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέρσου | καὶ πάντα τρόπον
 διαφθαρεῖσα ἐπέδωκεν ἀπανταχῇ, τῇ τε πόλει | κέρδος τὸ σύμπτωμα· ὑπὸ 20
 τοιαύτης χειρὸς ἐγείρεται πάντῃ σεμνοτέρα καὶ ὑψηλοτέρα καὶ

¹⁹. Cf. *Ors.* XVII.8; XX.14.

²⁰. Cf. *Ors.* XVII.5; XXI.4.

στεγανωτέρα, καλοῦμεν δὲ Ἀδράστειαν. | καλῶν δὲ ὄντων ἀπάντων τῶν
 ὀρωμένων τούτων κόσμων ἕτερον | μείζον προσείληφεν· οἰκιστὰι γὰρ αὐτῆς
 οἱ πάσας τὰς πόλεις ὑφ' | ἑαυτοῖς ἔχοντες, οὐς οὔτε φιλανθρωπία οὔτε
 ἔργων ἀποδείξεσιν | οὐδεὶς πω νενίκηκεν· ὥνπερ οἶμαι καὶ μόνων ἦν 25
 κρεῖττον τι τῆς| τότε Σμύρνης ἐξευρεῖν.

(Aristid. 21 (22) 2,25-6,4-5 K).

Pindar OL. I

In *Ol. I* the myth of Tantalus and Pelops begins, at 25-7, with a sentence which emphasises two points, Poseidon's love for Pelops and the falseness of the usual story of Pelops and the cauldron. The isolation of these three lines is very striking; several gnomic lines follow before the story is taken up again, at l. 36, with the ἔρανος of Tantalus and the Gods.

OLYMPIA I (476)

ἐπεὶ νιν καθαροῦ λέβη- 26
 τος ἔξελε Κλωθῶ,
 ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον ὦμον κεκαδμένον.
 (Ol. I.26-7).

One of the main concerns that occupy Pindar's diction is his concern for ὀρθὸς λόγος. The “true” story according to Pindar (which may have been his invention) is that Pelops had an “ivory” shoulder from his birth,²¹ or re-birth.²² It was the god Poseidon who saved Pelops due to his love by taking him to Olympus (as Ganyমেদে was at another time by Zeus) when Tantalus called the gods to an ἔρανος at Sipylos. Pelops' disappearance caused jealous gossip and gave rise to the false story that he had been served at dinner to the gods, by Tantalus. In this false tale, as Pindar presents it, Pelops was boiled in a pot (ἐν λέβητι), divided up, and eaten by the gods (cf. 49-52).

ἡμαχαίρα τάμον κατὰ μέλη,
 τραπέζαισί τ' ἀμφὶ δεύτατα κρεῶν 50
 σέθεν διεδάσαντο καὶ φάγον.
 (Ol. I.50-2).

²¹ Kirkwood 1982: 43. Lorimer (1936: 32), is puzzled by the reference to Pelops' ivory shoulder, “since his father did not dismember nor the gods consume it”. For a comprehensive discussion of the various explanations suggested, see Gerber 1982: 58 (27 ἐλέφαντι). See also Degani-Burzacchini 1977: 336-7. Cf. also Degani *Civiltà dei greci* 2, 261.

²² Instone 1996: 99.

The essence of the Pindaric version of the myth is the correction of the story: it is not true that Tantalus served his son to the gods at dinner. Such a representation of divine conduct is unthinkable for Pindar. This idea is echoed in Aristides' account; although he mentions briefly the component elements of the myth (κατὰ μέλη τμηθέντα...), he does not dwell on this brutality, because his emphasis is on Smyrna's praise.

The source for Pind. *Ol. I*

The element of the myth which is stressed in Aristides' paraphrase, and on this point he departs from Pindar's version, is the “ivory” shoulder that Pelops received for the one he lost when his pieces were taken out of the cauldron and put together.²³ This deed in Aristides' testimony is considered emphatically as the work of the goddess Demeter²⁴ (cf. τὸ ἔργον Δήμητρος γενέσθαι). On this point Aristides must have in mind various mythological versions of the story. This argument probably has its source in work of the great era of studies in mythology, which flourished under the Alexandrian Didymus and lasted through the first and second centuries AD. In this statement on Demeter Aristides follows the tradition of the commentators. This point of the myth may have attracted the attention of his teacher Alexander of Cotiaeum in his commentary on Pindar (cf. *Or.* XXXII.24). Aristides who probably studied the myth of *Ol. I* in his youth, reflects the tradition found in the corresponding *scholion*. This seems probable since Aristides' phraseology shows a similarity with the scholia preserved in the medieval manuscripts of Pindar:

<i>schol. Ol. I. 40e</i>	Aristid. 21(22), 2,26,4-7K
ἀφ' οὗ καὶ ὑγιῆς ἐγένετο, ὅτε τῆς Δήμητρος τὸν ὠμοπλάτην αὐτοῦ φαγούσης κατ' ἄγνοιαν ἐλεφάντινος ὠμος ἐτέθη αὐτῷ ὑπ' αὐτῆς. DHQ	ἐλλείποντος δὲ τοῦ ὤμου σχεῖν ἐλεφάντινον ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ φασὶ τὸ ἔργον Δήμητρος γενέσθαι.

²³. This is perhaps just an euphemism. According to the scholia on *Ol. I. 40a*, Demeter ate the shoulder being distracted by the loss of her daughter Persephone. Kirkwood (1982: 51), argues that “Pindar's specific mention of the shoulder suggests that he knew this version, he does not clarify or expand”. It is noteworthy that the gods in Aristides' paraphrase are not eating Pelops' pieces; only Demeter does whose deed turns out to be a blessing. According to Pindar's version it was the ivory shoulder which made the god Poseidon fall in love with the young Pelops. For erotic behaviour towards boys at banquets see Howie 1983: 292 and ns.114-6.

²⁴. *I.e.* the fact that he needed a new shoulder.

In both accounts the “ivory” shoulder is explicitly presented as the deed of Demeter.

However, there are certain variations in Pindar's scholia on *Olympian one*, which represent various stages of the transmission:

- i. 40a. μόνην δὲ τὴν Δήμητραν ἀγνοῖα μεταλαβεῖν λέγουσι· τινὲς δὲ τὴν Θέμιν.
- ii. 40c. λέγεται τῆς Δήμητρος ἀπογευσασμένης τῶν τοῦ Πέλοπος ὠμείων κρεῶν ἐλεφάντινον τὸν Ἑρμῆν ὦμον προσαρμόσαι τῷ Πέλοπι.

The wording in the scholia is not necessarily the same as in the commentary that Aristides used. Subsequent scholiasts made selections from the Alexandrian *ὑπομνήματα* preserving less sophisticated material, mainly mythological and historical. Their selection accounts for the differences found in the Byzantine Mss.

From the scholia on *Ol.* I.40a we are told that the gods invited Tantalus to this feast (see p.152). This is also what Aristides says about ἔρανος, and this is another indication that he may have used ancient commentaries on Pindar.

The comparative tabulation of Pindar's text and Aristides' testimony shows a correspondence in vocabulary and in the component elements of the myth:

<i>Olympian</i> I.26-7, 49	Aristid. 21(22), 2,26,4-7K
ἐπεὶ νιν καθαροῦ λέβητος ἔξελε Κλωθῶ, ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον ὦμον κεκαδμένον. μαχαίρα <u>τάμον κατὰ μέλη</u> .	οἷσθ' ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸν Πέλοπα <u>κατὰ μέλη</u> τμηθέντα ἐψηθέντα ἐν λέβητι συντεθῆναι πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ τοῦ λέβητος, ἐλλείποντος δὲ τοῦ ὦμου <u>σχεῖν ἐλεφάντινον</u> ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ φασὶ τὸ ἔργον Δήμητρος γενέσθαι·

After the paraphrase, Aristides offers an explanation, at §10, in which he attempts to draw a parallel between the plight of Smyrna and the fortune of Pelops.²⁵ Paraphrasing

²⁵. Bruno Keil, in his apparatus to Arist. *Or.* XX.19, suspected a reference to the boiling of Pelops (Pind. *Ol.* I.26). Aristides, however, only refers to “rejuvenation” and to the legendary bird Phoenix; for the story of Jason's rejuvenation, he may have had in mind passages like the *hypothesis* to Euripides' *Medea* which quotes the story from Pherecydes (F 113a) & Simonides (548 P.), and similar stories from Aeschylus (*Τροφοί* 246a [50] Radt Φερεκύδης δὲ [FGrHist 3 F113] καὶ Σιμωνίδης [PMG 548] φασὶν ὡς ἡ Μήδεια | ἀνεψήσασα τὸν Ἰάσονα νέον ποιήσειεν. περὶ δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ Αἰσονος ὁ τοῦς | Νόστους ποιήσας φησὶν οὕτως [fr. 6 Kinkel, Allen, Bethe]... Αἰσχύλος δὲ | ἐν [ταῖς Διονύσου] Τροφοῖς ἱστορεῖ ὅτι καὶ τὰς Διονύσου τροφούς μετὰ τῶν | ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν ἀνεψήσασα ἐνεοποίησεν), and the *Nostoi* (fr.7 Bernabé αὐτίκα δ' Αἰσονα θῆκε φίλον κόρον ἡβῶντα | γῆρας ἀποξύσασα ἰδυίησι πραπίδεσσιν. | φάρμακα πόλλ' ἔψουσ' ἐνὶ

parts of the mythic sections of the *Ol. I* and correlating them to contemporary life of Smyrna, his intention is to praise the new city of Smyrna with a fitting myth, which functions as a sort of mythical decoration. In an ingenious comparison the orator likens the earthquake and its aftermath to a cauldron which ‘burned all of it’.²⁶ As Pelops obtained a new “ivory” shoulder from Demeter, in a parallel way the new Smyrna has achieved a wonderful excess of beauty after its second composition thanks to Poseidon's deed, which although it was disastrous at the beginning, turned out to be beneficiary for Smyrna. This is a striking remoulding of the story of Pelops as it is adapted in his praise of Smyrna.

ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ποιηταί:

Aristides preserves in his *Ors.* XVII and XXI, four quotations from the poetry of Pindar and another five from Homer, which aim to illustrate the image of Smyrna. His quotations from the Homeric text are stated by the poet's name or are clearly implied, although this principle does not apply when he cites in paraphrase from Pindar. The poet's name is not mentioned in any of these references to his poetry, of which half come from the first *Olympian ode*. In *Ors.* XVII and XXI, the extracts from Pindar's poetry are introduced in an unusual manner as views that are shared by various poets in general: XXI.10 οἷσθ' ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ποιηταί; cf. XVII.3 ὥστε λέγουσιν οἱ ποιηταί; cf. *id.* 4 ὡς οἱ ποιηταὶ καλοῦσιν. The plural *ποιηταί* indicates an ambiguity. Aristides avoids on purpose identifying his exact source.²⁷ The rhetorical effect is that the words of Pindar acquire a universal value by being presented as words of many poets. The praise of the ancient city of Smyrna is the main concern and intention of the orator. He wants to present Smyrna as a unique city which was honoured by the favour of the gods.²⁸

χρυσείοισι λέβησιν). Cf. also **Aristophanes' Eq.** 1321 (τὸν Δῆμον ἀφεψήσας ὑμῖν καλὸν ἐξ αἰσχροῦ πεποίηκα); schol. *ad loc.* 1321a: ὥσπερ ἡ Μήδεια λέγεται τὰς τροφούς τοῦ Διονύσου ἀφεψήσασα ἀνανεάσαι [πάλιν *add. M*] ποιῆσαι. Cf. Hygin. *Fab.* 182, 2.

²⁶. This is an expression probably taken - as Keil notes in his apparatus - from Hdt. VIII.32, although the notion of the words has been changed.

²⁷. This habit of claiming vague authority, and at the same time disowning personal belief, goes back at least to Plato: *Men.* 81 A, *Grg.* 493 A, ἤκουσα τῶν σοφῶν.

²⁸. The idea in its conception is a reminiscence of the image of the city of Athens that Aristides treated in the peroration of his *Panathenaicos*.

The choice of paraphrase in Aristides' three quotations from *Olympian One* (ll. 25-7, 37-9, 49), is closely connected –as we have elsewhere pointed out– with his tendency to adapt Pindar's words freely into his context, especially when mythological connections are at issue.²⁹

²⁹. Cf. the discussion of Pind. *fr.* *31.

In his praise of Smyrna, although much of it is stereotyped¹, we can see in another perspective Aristides' ability in employing poetic expressions from Pindar. He tries to connect them with the mythic past and the three-stage development (πρεσβυτάτη, δευτέρᾳ and τρίτῳ), that Smyrna had undergone.

Aristides' context

A fictitious foundation is reported by Aristides as the second stage, in which the city was settled ὑπὸ τοῦ Σιπύλω.⁴

XVII. (15) ΣΜΥΡΝΑΙΚΟΣ [ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΟΣ].

(*Aristid.* 17 (15) 2,2,6-7K).

¹. Cf. the reference to the mythic founders of the city in all the Smyrnaean orations, as well as the comparison of the city to the bird phoenix (cf. *Or.* XVII.2, to *Or.* XX.19). For the three alleged foundations of Tantalus or Pelops, Theseus, and Alexander the Great, cf. here §§3-5 and *Or.* XXI.3-4, 10.

². Cf. *Or.* XVII.2 ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ οἱ δι' ἀκριβείας λόγοι...

³ The present quotation should be read closely with *Ol.* I.38-9, which refers to Smyrna's first stage.

4. In *Or.* XX.20 Aristides reports only one ancient Smyrna which was founded by Theseus and Alexander the Great.

The orator very elaborately illustrates the transition from the second to the third and last successive stage (τρίτῳ), that Smyrna underwent in reaching the modern state:

“by its third step, as the poets call it, the city achieved this single form”.

Pindar *Pyth.* III.43

The literary model of this statement is Pindar's *Pyth.* III.43, which Aristides preserves in paraphrase:

***PYTHIA III* (474?)**

τότ' ἔειπεν Ἀπόλλων· Ὀυκέτι
τλάσσομαι ψυχᾷ γένος ἁμὸν ὀλέσσαι
οἰκτροτάτῳ θανάτῳ ματρὸς βαρεῖα σὺν πάθῃ.
ὥς φάτο· βάματι δ' ἐν πρώτῳ κιχῶν παῖδ' ἐκ νεκροῦ
ἄρπασε· καιομένα δ' αὐτῷ διέφαινε πυρά.

40

43 πρώτῳ] τριτάτῳ Aristarchus, τρίτῳ Hartung.

(*Pyth.* III.40-4).

In *Pythian* III, Pindar tells the story of Coronis, who, beloved by Apollo, has the temerity to fall in love with a human being (Ἴσχυς: son of Elatos) and falls victim of the god's jealousy and theodicia.⁵ His divine vengeance punished Coronis by death by the arrows of Artemis. When Apollo snatches the unborn child Asclepius from his mother's pyre, he gets there βάματι δ' ἐν πρώτῳ, 'at the first step' (l. 43).

If Aristides had the Pindaric words in his mind, he purposely adapts them into a different context. In his paraphrase of l. 43, he introduces the following changes:

1. He employs Pindar's words in a metaphorical sense: As Apollo made a step from Python to save the unborn child from its mother's grievous fate, the city of Smyrna by a “third” step achieves this harmonious form. The connection between Smyrna and Apollo does not look so strong.

2. The city of Smyrna in Aristides' paraphrase makes the “third” step, whereas in Pindar Apollo makes the “first”.⁶

His rhetorical purpose is to create a new compliment for Smyrna out of *Pyth.* III.43. He adapts the words of Pindar, which in the context of his speech function as an

⁵ The story comes from the *Ῥοῖαι* of Hesiod where Apollo hears of Coronis' love for Ischys from a raven (fr. 123 R = 60 M-W). Pindar does not mention this incident. For the myth of Coronis see Wilamowitz 1896: 57ff.; Fehr 1936: 92-7; Stefos 1975: 58-75; see also Arrighetti 1987: 125-34; Burton 1962: 78-90, and recently Gentili 1995: 75 n.4.

⁶ Cf. schol. *Pyth.* III.75.

appropriate praise for his beloved city. This *oration* comes from the most active and best period of Aristides' career, from the time of the *Panathenaicus*, to which it shows some affinity;⁷ Aristides by now has obtained a more comprehensive knowledge of Pindar's poetry and is conversant with the poet's style. He makes now more often subtle references to Pindar. Although Pindar is referred to by name in compositions dating throughout his career, Aristides' predilection to give quotations without any acknowledgement to Pindar or claiming vague authority (*e.g.* ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ποιηταὶ),⁸ becomes more frequent in the last two periods of his life (*i.e.* AD 154-164, when he resumes his profession in full scale, and in AD 165-189).⁹ We can also assume that Aristides expected his audience / recipient of the speech to identify the suggested connections with Pindar.

The source for Pind. *Pyth.* III.43

Although there is a possibility that Aristides used several mythological handbooks in which various myths were collected, it seems less likely for this particular line to have been included in a mythological *compendium*, since it was a side issue to the myth of Coronis. It seems more plausible to have attracted the notice of an ὑπομνηματιστής or a lexicographer rather than of a mythologist and therefore one can assume that it was not classified in a compilation of myths. Although we can not exclude entirely the possibility that Aristides has quarried it out of certain *gnomologia* or *syllogae* of *proverbs*, nevertheless the character of Pindar's words is not proverbial and consequently seems not to deserve a place in this sort of manuals.¹⁰ However, it seems more likely that Aristides had studied *Pyth.* III in an earlier time from which he now paraphrases *l.*43, and in a metaphorical sense adapts the words of Pindar in his praise to the modern Smyrna.¹¹

This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that *Pyth.* III.43 aroused much debate even in the Hellenistic time. We are informed from the scholia on *Pyth.* III that

7. *E.g.* cf. XVII.13.

8. For this mode of citing cf. the discussion in introduction p.40ff., and *Ol.* I.26ff., p.158.

9. See the comparative table in p.358.

10. I have not found an ancient proverb of similar wording in the transmitted corpus.

11. There is a possibility that Aristides knew the myth of Coronis from Plato, who in *Rep.* 408 c, blames Pindar and οἱ τραγωδοποιοὶ for presenting Asclepius as 'avaricious'.

Aristarchus preferred the reading **τριτάτῳ** to that of the Mss **πρώτῳ**, after *Il.* 13.20: Poseidon steps from the summit of Samothrace¹² in: **τρὶς μὲν ὀρέξατ' ἰών (Ποσειδῶν), τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ἵκετο τέκμωρ.**¹³ The scholia on *Iliad* say that Pindar tried to improve Homer but exaggerates to the point of becoming precise: schol. *N* 20 (ὑπερβαλέσθαι δὲ τοῦτο θελήσας Πίνδαρος εἰς ὑπόνοιαν ἤκε ψεύδους).¹⁴

This Pindaric line was glossed in the ancient commentaries that Aristides may have used, as undoubtedly these attracted his attention:

75. β ἄ μ α τ ι δ' ἐ ν π ρ ὡ τ ῳ: ἐὰν μὲν γράφηται ἐν πρώτῳ, ὡς νῦν 20
γέγραπται, ἔσται ἐνὶ βήματι ὁ Ἀπόλλων ἀπὸ τῆς Πυθῶνος ἐληλυθὼς εἰς
Θεσσαλίαν· ἐὰν δὲ, ὡς ἐν τισι, βᾶματι δ' ἐν τριτάτῳ, ἔσται παραφράζων τὸ
τρὶς μὲν ὀρέξατ' ἰών (*N* 20). ἔστι δὲ σεμνότερον καὶ πρέπον τῷ θεῷ τὸ ἅμα
τῷ πρώτῳ βήματι ῥύσασθαι τὸν παῖδα, ἔστι δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀντίστροφον
σύμφωνον. ὁ μὲντοι Ἀρίσταρχος γράφει τριτάτῳ. BDEFGQ 5
(schol. *Pyth.* III.75 Drach.)

The scholia on Pindar have two different versions:

- a. The reading ἐν πρώτῳ is better because it fits the meter.¹⁵
- b. Aristarchus on the other hand preferred ἐν τριτάτῳ after Homer.¹⁶

Aristides' interpretation shows that he was familiar with the tradition of the scholiasts. The reading **τριτάτῳ** attracted his attention and he connected it to the three steps of Smyrna. Aristides probably knew this reading from the commentary of Aristarchus and adopted it.¹⁷

The scholia of Aristarchus preserved in our medieval Mss (*XII^{ex}-XIVⁱⁿ*), disclose his incisive critical spirit. He concerned himself with the interpretation of Pindar's text

¹². For Poseidon's awesome strides see Janko 1992: *ad loc.*

¹³. Aristarchus referred to Homer as he also did to the other poets in order to confirm his explanations, (cf. the testimonies in schol. *Nem.* VII.127c, VIII.48, III.16b, VI.21b), see Irigoin 1952: 55.

¹⁴. Gildersleeve 1908: *ad loc.* πρώτῳ is "an exaggeration of τριτάτῳ".

¹⁵. For its correctness cf. Young 1968: 40 n.1.

¹⁶. ἐν τισι implies that τριτάτῳ was not Aristarchus' conjecture, but an attested variant in Mss. "Ἐν τισι" like "οὕτως", are formulaic expressions found in papyri serving to notify the reader of the existence of alternative reading. On these verbal formulae cf. McNamee 1977: 90-6.

¹⁷. Fragments of Aristarchus' commentary may have been included in Alexander' *ὑπόμνημα*. Indeed it is possible that Alexander's commentary may have been concerned also with matters of textual criticism if we believe Aristides' remark (*Or.* XXXII.21), that "his teacher added after his name 'Ἀλέξανδρος' the name of his native city in the books which he corrected" (ἐπεὶ κὰν τοῖς βιβλίοις ἃ διωρθοῦτο τοῦτο ἐγκαταλείπεται σύμβολον).

and was interested in detailed literary, mythological, historic, and geographical issues.¹⁸ However, the dozens of his variants did not enter the mainstream Mss tradition which remained faithful to the text adopted by Aristophanes of Byzantium. The same happened with his variants in his *ὑπόμνημα* on Homer.¹⁹

Therefore, Aristarchus' *τριτάτω* is clearly a literary variant which probably was preserved in an independent commentary and it had entered a number of Byzantine Mss (ὥς ἔν τισι), in a time later than that of Aristides.

Thus, it is reasonable to conjecture that Aristides may well have quoted *τριτάτω* from an ancient *ὑπόμνημα* in which Aristarchus' reading and exegesis were preserved, and not from a papyrus of Pindar's *Pythians*, since it was very rare for readings from the *ὑπομνήματα* to enter the main tradition of the text.

Finally, the fact that Aristides draws on the tradition of the commentators in his quotation of *Pyth.* III.83, it is equally possible that he had used an ancient *ὑπόμνημα* on *Pyth.* III.43, as well.

From that similarity between Aristides' paraphrase and the scholia, it becomes clear that Aristides was conversant with the commentators' disagreements, since he sides himself with the tradition of Aristarchus in paraphrasing “*by its third step ... the city achieved this single, harmonious form*”.

What emerges from Aristides' use of Pindaric quotations in his Smyranean orations is the following:

1. Aristides consistently avoids stating his authority, and the words of Pindar are introduced as a common view shared among the poets.
2. All the quotations are compliments for Smyrna and are given in paraphrase.
3. Aristides understands adequately the original meaning of the words as they have been intended by Pindar. The words in the context of Aristides' speeches preserve

¹⁸. Irigoin 1952: 54-5.

¹⁹. *Ibid* 52 with n.2.

much of the original style and nuance. Whereas in *Or.* XVII.3 paraphrasing *Ol.* I.38, he offers a slightly different interpretation on the meaning of Pindar's θεοφιλής.

III. *QUOTATIONS in support of*
Aristides' ARGUMENTATIO

- III. 1** Quotations in Polemic treatises against Plato
- III. 2** Quotations against contemporary '*Sophists*'
- III. 3** Quotations: comparison in terms of '*concord*' and '*beauty*'
- III. 4** Other quotations in support of Aristides' '*argumentatio*'

III. 1 QUOTATIONS IN POLEMIC TREATISES AGAINST PLATO

III.1.i Or.II. Πρὸς Πλάτωνα Ὑπὲρ Ῥητορικῆς (Λόγοι Α, Β)¹

Introduction - background

This oration was composed in Pergamum during the period of *Cathedra* (AD 145-147),² at the height of Aristides' incapacitating illness when he was an incubant at the temple of Asclepius.³ The tone, style, and use of citations recalls *Or. XXVIII*, a contemporary composition.

The present speech of Aristides turns especially against Plato's *Gorgias* and claims to prove the primacy of rhetoric as well as its character as a *techne*, aiming at bringing to light the contradictions in Plato's own position, expressed in the *Gorgias* itself, *seventh Epistle*, *Laws*, *Politicus*, *Menexenus*, *Phaedrus*, and *Euthydemus*.

During Aristides' time, a century marked by the rise of the Second Sophistic, Rhetoric was enjoying a celebrated status as a main part of the education of the young and was indeed preferred by the most aspiring among them, who were keen through its teaching to achieve prominent status in society. Schools of rhetoric were flourishing in many cities, while the youth were attracted to the great names in the profession whose presence in a city would elevate its standing as an educational centre.

Rhetoric was in fact challenging philosophy by claiming to be something more than a "vocational" discipline, teaching only persuasion, in the sense derogated by the philosophers. Instead it was claiming for itself the status of a wider discipline imparting knowledge and skills both on a theoretical level, as a study in the principles and virtues of eloquence, but also in other fields of practical significance and visible career rewards, as in law courts, city politics and embassies. Thus, it offered good reasons for the aspiring youth to pursue its study and practice. It is precisely because philosophy saw rhetoric making claims over a shared field of activities that the rivalry was so bitter.

Plato's *Gorgias* had fired the first shots against rhetoric, addressing the sort of questions which provoked the pertinent arguments against rhetoric throughout antiquity, and indeed shaped ever since the whole framework of the discussion.

Rhetoric was ever since in the defensive answering these questions, as posed by Plato: "*what is the nature of rhetoric*", "*is it an art at all*" and "*what is its value in society*". Overall, Plato's attack had a lasting consequence by putting rhetoric in a bad light,

¹ Behr (1973: 280 n.a), assumes that the division into two books was as old as Sopater of Apamea. It is possible that Porphyry knew nothing of this unnatural division (cf. Behr 1968: 198).

² Aristides' whimsical name, denoting the "period of inactivity" for the period of his incubation at Asclepieion; On the *Cathedra* cf. Introduction p.15, n.13.

³ Swain 1996: 257; Behr 1968a: 54-6.

discrediting it as a trivial and shallow pursuit of the art of persuasion, as opposed to philosophy that was an honest search for the truth. Rhetoric was shown to occupy the other pole of two distinct ways of thinking about language and the world, devotion to truth and depth of knowledge being ever since identified with philosophy while self-interest and empty verbalism was identified with rhetoric.

It is a picture rhetors would not put up with, and Aristides' work, –mainly the three treatises against Plato's accusations against rhetoric (most notably the more theoretical of them, *Πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς*) –, shows that at least in part he has Platonists of his time in mind although it is at any rate his strategy not to add other names that have not added anything important to the arguments elaborated by Plato. His careful treatment of the great philosopher shows that he is trying to avoid criticisms of insolence against such a great figure of the past. Most probably he had the Middle Platonists of Pergamum in mind (questionably identified with the “phantom” school of Gaius - or “Caius” by Behr).⁴ Although they (mainly Albinus) were more interested in Platonic cosmogony and the *Timaeus*, they would include in their scholarly expositions of their great master's teachings at least brief references to his treatment of Rhetoric (as in Apuleius' *Διδασκαλικός*).⁵

On the other hand, the assumption that Aristides' answer was prompted by the Cynics (strongly favoured by Behr) does not seem adequately documented.⁶ It is of course the Sceptics who launched the heftiest attack, through Sextus' writings, and it is interesting to witness how Sextus undertakes the task to demystify rhetoric attacking it not as a dogmatic discipline but as an opponent to philosophy. He appears to represent the whole of philosophy, and not only the sceptical tradition, in attacking Rhetoric. The dispute was after all not simply a theoretical debate, but mainly the result of an antagonism over the educational supremacy of the times, a territorial, as it were, dispute. In taking up the debate and singling out Plato as his enemy, Aristides thus is not simply addressing a problem belonging to the distant past; he enters a debate that has flared up again following the appeal of rhetoric as an educational choice for the youth emerging during the time of the second Sophistic.

Judging from the fact (related to us in Suda) that the Neoplatonist Porphyry undertook to reply to Aristides,⁷ it is evident that his arguments were regarded as a serious matter by the philosophers.⁸ It was the last great intellectual battle in Antiquity

4. Behr 1968a: 54ff.

5. Dillon 1996: 333.

6. Cf. Appendix p.352, with n.15.

7. In seven books; only a few fragments survive in quotations in Olympiodorus. His *operis fragmenta* were collected by Behr 1968.

8. Michel (1993: 26-8), argues that '*Rhetorique*' was not devoid of philosophical interests, and indeed Aristides, an admirer of Plato, attacks Plato's vehement condemnation of Rhetoric only to seek some sort of conciliation between rhetoric and platonic philosophy, a conciliation rendered in principle possible in the syncretistic spirit of the epoch. Moerschini, however, detects a certain eagerness on the part of Michel to see Platonic elements in Aristides, because he strives to show the Second sophistic as a

and it was conducted from the part of Aristides in a grand manner recalling the greatest moments of Attic diction; although he has often been thought of as lacking in interest in what he has to say, being inferior to Isocrates and, among his contemporaries, Plutarch, Dio and Lucian, his style represents the “*ideal of imperial Atticism*”, and he is, tellingly, “the only imperial writer accepted by the later rhetoricians on a par with the Attic orators”.⁹

Aristides in his *Or.* II.21-31, considers Plato's over-contentious remarks about oratory when he used the literary contrivance of a meeting of Gorgias and Socrates at Athens. The *Gorgias* was among those Platonic dialogues which were most generally read and admired in later antiquity.¹⁰ It was of special interest to students of rhetoric. Aristides employing legal terminology¹¹ begins the refutation of Plato's charge by quoting Plato's statements at §22.

Answering Polus' question what cookery and rhetoric have in common Socrates declares them as both being forms of flattery. He goes on to point to the *differentia* of rhetoric, defining it as “*the counterfeit of one branch (μόριον) of politics*” (463d2). In doing this, Socrates uses the device of making rhetoric a subdivision of something less worthy, here, the spurious counterpart of γνησία πολιτική, a canny contrivance which was already exploited in the *Euthydemus*, where the art of the professional speech-writer was to be τῆς τῶν ἐπρωδῶν τέχνης μόριον (289e5).

Here, the whole of which rhetoric forms part is a στοχαστική (skilful at aiming or good at guessing) false, *i.e.* non-scientific, τέχνη.

At 463e5–466a3 Socrates proceeds to explain the analogy he has in mind, which is built along two major axis, that of the genuine arts and that of the false counterparts, εἰδωλον. The latter are distinguished by their different aim, inferior to the genuine arts (τέχνη), as well as by their different epistemological status: art proceeds to provide explanations, knowing the causes, while the false counterpart or spurious form, εἰδωλον, consists in ἐμπειρία without λόγος. But they also differ as to their aim:

movement than attempted a great unification of the philosophical schools, and in this effort drawing Aristides closer to Apuleius. It was, for Michel, a *de facto* truth for educated people, the revered image of πεπαιδευμένοι of the epoch after all, to “*seek conciliation*” (Moreschini 1994: 1246).

⁹ Kennedy 1972: 585. Also, *idem* 1994: 241.

¹⁰ The *Gorgias* was one of the *πραττόμενοι*, the dialogues which were regularly lectured on in the later Neoplatonic Schools. According to Dodds (1990: 63f.), various authors as Cicero, Epictetus, Athenaeus and Christian writers were attracted by its lofty moral teaching (cf. Dodds' Index I). Earlier interest in the *Gorgias* is attested by the title of a lost work by Eubulus, (Head of the Academy, III AD), “*Περὶ τοῦ Φιλίβου καὶ τοῦ Γοργίου καὶ τῶν Ἀριστοτέλει πρὸς τὴν Πλάτωνος πολιτείαν ἀντειρημένων*” (Porph. *vit. Plot.* 20.41). The author of the *Consolatio ad Apollonium* has transcribed the myth. Aristides (II.20), tells us that some admired it more than any other work of Plato, and many, as Quintilian says (*IO* 2.15.14), were content to read a few excerpts from it. Iamblichus pillages *Gorgias* to provide material for his *Protrepticus*.

¹¹ Behr (1968a: 55 in n.53), argues that Aristides has chosen terms from 5th and 4th cent. Athens: παρηγορία (‘freedom of speech’) and πρὸς χάριν (to speak ‘to please the mob’).

whereas the spurious arts seek merely pleasure, genuine arts aim for the best (βέλτιστον) or the true (ἀληθές) and these are both rationally determinable, (λόγῳ), as opposed to ἡδονή which (in Aristotle, Democritus) is said to be indeterminable and having ἄλλο ἄλλῳ.¹²

Plato here shows his early interest in systematic classification later prominent in the *Sophista*, by sketching an (unnecessarily) complete table of all terms in his analogy, including the “anonymous” (ἄνωνυμον) term, *i.e.* that of the body-tendance arts. In all there are two genuine arts which minister to the σῶμα and two which minister to the ψυχή. Each of these is shadowed by a spurious counterpart or pure imitation (εἰδωλον), which is a form of κολακεία (κολακεία aiming for ἡδονή, the pleasurable). As said above, the four spurious arts are distinguishable in two ways from the genuine – by their aim, which is merely pleasure, and by their empirical character, which means that they cannot give any rational account of their procedure. The analogy Socrates sketches concludes that rhetoric is the intellectual counterpart of cookery (465d7), for as cookery stands towards the genuine art of medicine in the body-tendance arts, so does rhetoric stand towards δικαιοσύνη in the mind-tending πολιτικά τέχναι.¹³

¹². Aristot. *Metaph.* 1070^b27; *EN* 1153^a23.

¹³. **Dodds** (1990: 227) succinctly remarks that in drawing his analogy Plato overlooks the obvious difference that the arts of mind-tendance (πολιτική) are concerned with society as a whole, while their counterparts of body-tendance are concerned with the individual and, Dodds points out, would rather correspond with the education (μουσική and psychiatry). Perhaps Plato ignores this difference in his analogy between rhetorician and pastry-cook (ὀψοποιός) because it stands out in his mind that the basic task of the statesman is educational.

III.1.1 Aristid. 2, 109 (1,178 L.-B.) = Pind. Ol. II.86-8.

Aristides' context

Aristides from §84 onwards of this speech cites a series of quotations from the most distinguished of the poets. The main idea of these is that every form of human *technē* originates from the Gods:

1. Homer

Aristides in a series of 16 quotations from Homer, tries to demonstrate that the glorious achievements of Demodocus and Alcinous do not derive from their art but from divine inspiration.¹⁴ In a certain way he believes that *Homer links and joins together knowledge and prompting by the god, and again assigns his nature and education to the divine portion* (*Od.* 3.26-8). Aristides employing these quotes from Homer paints a picture of Telemachus who acts as orator through the divine help without having ἐμπειρία. In these quotes, Homer is presented as emphasizing the dignity of oratory and the greatness and the extent of its power, and clearly attributes these things to the God. Aristides assumes that these Homeric extracts might represent Homer's answer to Plato himself and not to the Phaeacian Euryalus (ὥσπερ Πλάτῳ ἀποκρινάμενος, οὐκ Εὐρύαλῳ).

2. Hesiod

Aristides proceeds with the discussion of a quotation from Hesiod who, he believes, holds the same opinion as Homer differing only in expression:¹⁵

97	Κεῖνος μὲν πανάριστος ὃς αὐτῷ πάντα νοήσῃ·	<i>Op.</i> 293	15
	ἔσθλός δ' αὖ καὶ κεῖνος ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθεται·	295	
	ὃς δέ γε μήτ' αὐτὸς νοεῖ μήτ' ἄλλου ἀκούων	296	
	ἐν θυμῷ βάλλεται, ὃ δ' αὖτ' ἀχρήσιος ἀνήρ.	297	

Aristides (§100) argues that according to Plato's reasoning the conception of an idea is superior to learning one, on the ground that art is inferior to nature (: τέχνη φύσεως δεύτερον). The idea of the *pre-eminence of nature* is stressed explicitly by Aristides (§101) who paraphrasing Hesiod's words assumes that the poet of Helicon has

¹⁴. Cf. the quotation of *Od.* 8.489 σέ γε Μοῦσ' ἐδιδάξε at §88.

¹⁵. Aristides' source must be the text of other authors; cf. p. 54 'double borrowing'.

defined as *first* and *best* that man who has ‘*thought out all things for himself*’, whereas him who has listened and learned only ‘*second*’. According to Aristides the learner cannot be made best since it is prohibited by nature which is everywhere superior (*cf. §104*).

106 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μανθάνων ὠμολόγηκεν δῆπουθεν εἶναι χείρων | αὐτῷ γε τῷ δεῖσθαι 18
μαθεῖν· ὥς εἴ γε μὴ πείσειεν αὐτὸν δεῖσθαι πρότερον, | πῶς ἂν μάθοι, ἢ πῶς ἄλλω 1
107 γ’ ἂν εἰπόντι πεισθεῖη; οὐκοῦν ἄτοπον τὸν γε | αὐτὸν ὠμολογηκότα εἶναι χείρω,
τοῦτον ἀμείνω καλεῖν, καὶ ταῦτα δι’ | αὐτὸ τοῦτ’ ἐπαινούμενον, ὅτι ὠμολόγηκεν
χείρων εἶναι. ἢ κατὰ μὲν τὰς | δωρεὰς οὐδαμοῦ κρείττων ὁ λαβὼν τοῦ δόντος
αὐτῷ τῷ λαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὸ | δοῦναι τοῦ κρείττονος εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἐν δὲ τοῖς 5
μαθήμασιν κρείττων ὁ | προσέχων τὸν νοῦν τοῦ νοήσαντος αὐτοῦ καὶ
108 παρασχόντος; καὶ μὴν ἐφ’ | οἷς ὁ λαβὼν ἄριστος πῶς οὐ πρῶτος ὁ ταῦτ’ ἔχων ἐξ
ἀρχῆς, καὶ διὰ τὸν | χρόνον γέ που καὶ παρὰ τὴν αἰτίαν;

(*Aristid. 2,106-8 (1,177-8 L.-B.)*)

Someone who is in process of learning is inferior to one who first conceived the idea and undoubtedly deserves the highest rank.

3. Pindar

Aristides identifies the role of orator with that of the σοφός as it has been illustrated by Pindar; Aristides wanted to take issue with Plato on this basis.

Four citations explicitly ascribed to Pindar,¹⁶ are brought in by Aristides for discussion: *Ol.* II.86-8 at §109; *Ol.* IX.100-2 and *Ol.* IX.27-9 at §110, and *fr.* *38 at §112. Aristides introduces them as evidence (μαρτυρίαν) in his harangue of Plato's scurrility against oratory.

These quotations are used as integral to Aristides' argument and consequently they occur as in some degree appropriate or relevant to the context of discussion.¹⁷ He feels the need to justify his choice of Pindar on the ground that even Plato himself used

¹⁶. Aristides prefers to refer to an author by a periphrasis, often involving his πατρίς; cf. p.40 n.27.

¹⁷. Therefore, Pindar's words here have a more serious bearing on the subject under discussion, than the extended use and application of verses from Homer at previous paragraphs.

him “in the most important matters”,¹⁸ as they say.¹⁹ Aristides here associates the poet's views on the *divine descent of his σοφία* with the *superiority of the ρήτωρ*.

The first quatrain (*Ol.* II.86-8) is introduced by Aristides in an ostentatious way:²⁰

“This man, O gods, in revealing the evidence of his nature and Muse, truly shouts out in a Stentorian voice²¹ to mankind, like a herald calling for attention”.

II. (XLV D.) ΠΡΟΣ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΡΗΤΟΡΙΚΗΣ.

109 Ἔτι τοίνυν ἑνὸς ποιητοῦ τῶν ἀπὸ Βοιωτίας καὶ Ἑλικῶνος
 παρασχέσομαι μαρτυρίαν, ὥ καὶ Πλάτων αὐτὸς τὰ πλείστου, φασὶν, ἄξια | 10
 χρῆται. οὗτος δὲ, ὡ θεοί, καὶ μάλ' ἀποκαλύψας καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως | καὶ
 Μούσης ὡς ἀληθῶς βοᾷ Στεντόρειον εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὥσπερ | σιωπῇν
 κηρύξας

Σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾷ·

μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι

παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὡς ἄκραντα γαρεύετον

15

Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.

κοράκων φησὶν εἶναι φωνὰς τὰς τῶν μαθόντων καὶ παρ' ἄλλων εἰληφόντων |
 πρὸς ἀετὸν γιγνομένας τὸν φύσει νικῶντα καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ ρήτορα καὶ σοφόν.

(*Aristid.* 2,109 (1,178 L.-B.))

In this gnomic statement Pindar expresses the traditional belief²² in inborn ability which is typically aristocratic.²³ He argues that the man born with ἀρετά can achieve greatness whereas the person who has had to learn will never achieve the superiority of the natural poet.²⁴

18. Cf. schol. *Aristid.* 3,393 Dind. Pindar is the source (usually acknowledged by Plato) of about a dozen quotations, only two of which are from extant odes of victory—*Phdr.* 227b, (: *Isth.* 1.2) and *Euthd.* 304b (: *Ol.* I.1).

19. Aristides' scholiast (3,393 Dind.) thinks of a proverb. For the expression see *Th.* II.15.5 τὰ πλείστου ἄξια ἐχρῶντο.

20. Cf. also the discussion on p. 283ff., where *Ol.* II.86-8 is cited at *Aristid. Or.* XXVIII.55.

21. By evoking the scene of a herald addressing loudly the community as a medium of mass communication, Aristides puts special importance on his quotation, thus arresting the reader's notice. Cf. *Or.* II.351 Στέντορος φωνὴν κτησαίμεθα; *Arist. Pol.* 1326^b5 κῆρυξ... Στεντόρειος.

22. This striking and rather arrogant declaration not only expresses Pindar's own outlook but is a traditional saying according to a scholion *Ol.* II.154b ὁ λόγος γνωμικός.

23. *Lanata* 1963: 84. For Pindar's high appreciation of natural abilities cf. *Haedicke* 1936: 50-6; *Becker* 1937: 65-7; *Heinimann* 1945: 99-101.

24. However, Pindar does not despise the benefit of experience and practice, cf. *Ol.* VII.53 δαέντι, in *Ol.* VIII.60 he praises the trainer.

Aristides has also taken much trouble to avoid monotony in quoting these similar extracts from Pindar, by varying the pace, tone and style of his discussion of Pindaric conception of σοφός. He skilfully eliminates the dryness of the quotation by adducing it as *μαρτυρία* into the body of his argument. The reader's interest is rekindled by splendid displays of his knowledge of Pindar's poetry which were highly appreciated by his audience.

If we begin from the understanding that in Pindar the adjective σοφός frequently refers to the poet,²⁵ and σοφία to poetry²⁶ (e.g. *Isth.* VII.18), and recall the religious assumption that supreme deeds require the help of the god, is not difficult to see that Aristides' purpose is to equate the ῥήτωρ to the σοφός, as requiring the favour and help of the god to achieve excellence. Aristides, paraphrasing the poet's words themselves, unequivocally contrasts those who have learned and receive knowledge from others = κόρακες, to the naturally superior man who is an orator and a wise man = ἀετός.²⁷

The propounded identification of σοφός with ῥήτωρ by Aristides is ingenious, because, if we must – according to the Pindaric text – have rivalry, this in the context of Aristides can well be defined between the real art of oratory and that of his opponents, who here are implied in μαθόντες and παρ' ἄλλων εἰληφότων, and are attacked by Aristides at §111, in the discussion of his third quote from Pindar.²⁸

In this felicitous quotation Aristides lays special emphasis on poet's words. The expression ὥσπερ σιωπὴν κηρύξας indicates a professedly *verbatim citation*, in which Aristides may have been careless in copying, preserving a slightly different version:

25. The most fundamental meaning of σοφία is “the ability of the skilled craftsman”. (Maehler 1963: 67). Although Pindar may have been the first to call himself σοφός (cf. Svoboda 1952: 108. Maehler [1963: 94], argues for the conventionality of the usage), the use of the word σοφία in reference to poetry is of long standing (cf. *h. Merc.* 483, 511; Solon *fr.* 1.52D). For Most (1985: 145), ‘σοφός’ describes always an “intelligent man”.

26. The concept of σοφία in Pindar clearly refers to the content of poetry, its truth and hence its moral / religious outlook. (Cf. Komornicka 1972: 252 ‘*connaissance intuitive*’).

27. For a parallel use of this idea cf. the proemium of part two of *Or.* II.321, where he claims that the gods do not give everything to everyone: οὐ γὰρ ἡμεν τῆς σῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ σοφίας ἐπιστήμονες, πάντα δ' οὐ πᾶσιν οἱ θεοὶ διδόασιν.

28. See *Pyth.* I.94, where the panegyric side of oratory is recognised. Close to this point is Verrall's suggestion, (quoted by Gildersleeve 1908: 153), that the reference is to the two Sicilian rhetoricians, Korax and Tisias (the latter of whom was called κακοῦ κόρακος κακὸν ῥόν); an interpretation not accepted by anyone nowadays.

<i>Ol. II.86-88 in Aristides' text</i>	<i>Pindar's Ol. II.86-88</i>
<p>Σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾶ· μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὥς ἄκραντα <u>γαρύετον</u> Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον.</p>	<p>σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾶ· μαθόντες δὲ λάβροι παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὥς ἄκραντα <u>γαρυέτων</u> Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον·</p>
<p>15 λάβροι] παῦροι U 16 παγγλωσσία QR (-αι) E (-αι) U: πανγλωσσίαι T (-α) V¹ Aa² (-α) V² (-α): πανγλωσία a¹; secundum Keil, παγγλωσσίαι in A Or. XXVIII 55 γαρύετον TQUA^aV²R²: γάρ ὕετον V¹A¹R¹E¹ 17 ὄρνιχα TQVU <i>plerique libri Pindari</i>: ὄρνιθα AREa.</p>	<p>86 λαῦροι AE^{ac} 87 παγγλωσσίαι A, Canter παγγλωσσίαι C^{pc}Θ παγκλωσσίαι C^{ac}: παγγλω(σ)ί α(α) BLEGHN, παγγλωσσία <i>vulgo editores. Sed παγγλωσσίαι legebant Aristid. 2,109 (1,178 L.-B.) et 28(49, 2,159,14K.), γαρύετον</i>: Bgk 88 ὄρνιθα A¹C^bN Theophyl., ὄρνιχα rell., Simpl.</p>

γαρύετον: (Aristid.) γαρύετον : γαρυέτων (Pind.). In O represented by the primary manuscripts TQUA^aV²R², is preserved the reading γαρύετον (:3rd person dual indicative). Clearly Pindar's γαρυέτων was read by A as γαρύετον, and this is what Aristides wrote, since this reading is provided by the majority of his manuscript tradition. Yet none of the variants is right (cf. γάρ ὕετον V¹A¹R¹E¹), and the correct reading is probably γαρυέτων, restored by Bergk.²⁹ The passage has been subject to an immense amount of discussion; the form γαρύετον and the exact interpretation of this line have been contested since antiquity, cf. schol. *Ol. II.158b* τὸ [δέ] γαρύετον κακῶς· οὐδὲ γάρ ἐπὶ δυϊκοῦ βούλεται ἢ λέξις, οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ δύο κοράκων, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.³⁰

In the c. 5th BC the old Attic alphabet did not make the distinction between the vowels: H and E, O and Ω, O and OY.³¹ When later the Alexandrians edited the text of *Olympian II*, they sometimes failed to change the O (old alphabet) to Ω in the new alphabet in those Pindaric copies written in the old Attic alphabet.³² The Alexandrian editors preferred the dual form γαρύετον which certainly suggests a definite pair. This

²⁹. However many scholars following the scholia, have favoured the dual cf. **Jebb** 1905: 15-22 and **Gildersleeve** 1908, followed by **Gentili** 1958: 24-8; **Carrière** 1962: 42-4; cf. also **Kirkwood** 1982 and **Willcock** 1995.

³⁰. However a number of scholiasts interpreted it as dual, cf. schol. *Ol. II.158d*. Also they gave the generally prevalent view that Pindar is alluding to Simonides and Bacchylides. This interpretation has been questioned many times. See the full discussion by **Kirkwood** 1981: 240-3, who has dismissed too easily the possibility that Pindar may have used the dual for plural on the basis of an assumed Homeric precedent. For the opposite argument that thematic 3rd plural imperative ending in -των is not attested, and also that the dual may arise from the Greek tradition concerning pairs of birds see also **Kirkwood** 1982: *ad loc.*

³¹. Cf. **Irigoin** 1952: 22 with n.6; **Reynolds-Wilson** 1991: 8.

³². A similar case is *Nem. 1.24* ἐσλός which Aristarchus corrected to ἐσλούς.

scornful note of superiority was assumed by the commentators to refer to Simonides and Bacchylides.

Thus, it is tempting to see in Aristides' use of the dual form γαρεύετον an indication that he was conversant with this scholarly work of the Alexandrians, probably present in the *ὑπομνήματα* on Pindar, like those that were used in rhetorical schools in Aristides' time. However, while this conclusion remains a possibility, it is also possible that Aristides was just readily adopting the vulgate version, and there is no additional evidence to support the former explanation against the latter, less controversial, conjecture.

παγγλωσσία: It is also to be noticed that the scholia offer nothing beyond the reading preserved by O. The scholiast on Aristid. explains it as πολυλογία (A) which means *loquacity, much to say* (cf. Pl. *Lg.* 641e; Aristot. *Pol.* 1295^{a2}).

δρνιχα: Aristides here shares the true reading which has suffered a good deal in transmission in ζ family of Pindar: A¹C^bN.

Aristides' quotation represents an important line of the tradition of *Ol.* II.86-8, since it is the oldest one and preserves more text (3 verses in Maehler's edition) than the other citators.

Aristides cited a truncated form of the same quotation in the *Or.* XXVIII, preserving also the reading γαρεύετον.³³

Aristides' exegesis, which follows his quotation of *Ol.* II.86-8 in both *Ors.* II and XXVIII, is quite similar to the medieval scholia on *Ol.* II.157a+b, preserved in the Ms. A (*Ambros.* C 222 inf., ca. 1280), although the wording is different. In both orations Aristides' phraseology shows an affinity with the corresponding scholia preserved in A; therefore, his testimony makes an interesting point in showing the antiquity of the scholia in A:

³³. It has not been possible to establish the precise chronological order of both orations. Boulanger has made no attempt to date *Or.* II, whereas Behr simply dates both speeches to the same period on internal evidence (1968a: 53-5 with ns.48, 52). *Fr.* 108a is also quoted twice in varying form and wording.

<i>schol. Ol. II. 157a</i>	<i>Aristid. 2, 109 (1,178 L.-B.)</i>
κ ό ρ α κ ε ς: οἷον, ὡς κόρακες πρὸς ἀετὸν ἀντιβοῶντες, οὕτως οἱ μαθόντες πρὸς τὸν φύσει σοφόν. Α	κοράκων φησὶν εἶναι φωνάς τὰς τῶν μαθόντων καὶ παρ' ἄλλων εἰληφόντων πρὸς ἀετὸν γιγνομένης τὸν φύσει νικῶντα καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ ῥήτορα καὶ σοφόν.
<i>schol. Ol. II. 157a, b</i>	<i>Aristid. 28(49), 2,159,21-2K</i>
<p>a. ...ἐαυτὸν λέγων ἀετὸν, κόρακας δὲ τοὺς ἀντιτέχνους. Α</p> <p>b. τοὺς εὐφυεῖς ἀετοῖς παραβάλλει, τοὺς ἀφυεῖς κόραξιν. Α</p>	<p>καλεῖ κόρακας μὲν τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς, ἀετὸν δ' ἐαυτὸν πρὸς ἐκείνους;</p> <p>οὔκουν τοσοῦτῳ κρείττω τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ἐαυτὸν, ὅσον κοράκων ἀετός;</p>

Both Aristides' exegesis and the medieval notes may have as a common source a grammarian's *ὑπόμνημα* on the *Olympians*: such a commentary would probably have been circulated widely, for the *Ἐπινίκια* of Pindar served as school texts during antiquity and the Middle Ages.

In both *orations*, *Ol. II.86-8* is cited within a series of quotes from Pindar's poetry. This is one of the techniques that Aristides followed in grouping quotation from Homer and Pindar.³⁴

³⁴. Cf. Introduction p.41.

III.1.1 Aristid. 2, 110 (1,179 L.-B.) = Pind. Ol. IX.100-2.

In a similar way Pindar at *Ol. IX.100-2* after a long list of victories due to the natural endowment (φυῆ) of the athlete Epharmostos, contrasts them with the fruitless endeavours of those who have tried to gain glory:

“all that is from nature is the best; but many through the taught virtues of mankind have been eager to win reputation”.

This statement along with the one in *Olympian II* is among the boldest of Pindar on the importance of inborn excellence, and as Gildersleeve says, *“It is part and parcel of his aristocratic ‘blood’ theory.”*³⁵

II. (XLV D.) ΠΡΟΣ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΡΗΤΟΡΙΚΗΣ.

110 ἐτέρωθι δ' αὖ βραχύτερον μέν, γνωρίμως δ' οὐχ ἥττον διαμαρτύρεται 20

Τὸ δὲ φυῆ κράτιστον ἅπαν.
πολλοὶ δὲ διδασκταῖς
ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς κλέος
ᾠρουν ἀίρεϊσθαι,

σφόδρ' ἀκολούθως ἀμφοτέρω εἰπών. ἐπεὶ γὰρ τὸ μὲν κράτιστον ἐν| τοῖς 5
ὀλίγοις, τὰ δὲ φαυλότερα ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἀντιτίθεικε τῷ κρατίστῳ | τὸ
[πολλῷ] χεῖρον διὰ τοῦ τῶν πολλῶν ὀνόματος, ὡς ἐκεῖνο μὲν παντά|πασιν
τινῶν ὀλίγων ὄν, τοῦτο δὲ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀφικνούμενον.

(Aristid. 2,110 (1,178-9 L.-B.))

Aristides' context

It is important here to follow the stages along which Aristides' argument is being developed through his poetic quotations:

1. *Homer*: Knowledge and techne derive from divine inspiration.
2. *Hesiod*: The learner is inferior to whom who first conceived the idea.
3. *Pindar*:
 - a. *Ol. II.86-8*: Σοφός is superior and in Aristides' reasoning is equated and identified to ῥήτωρ.
 - b. *Ol. IX.100-2*: Pindar is presented as agreeing with Hesiod on the inferiority of the learner.

³⁵. Svoboda 1952: 116.

Aristides at §110 quotes another quatrain from the *ninth Olympian ode* which he considers to be consistent with *Ol.* II.86-8 (σφόδρ' ἀκολούθως ἀμφοτέρω εἰπών). Both after in his quotation of *Ol.* II and here as well, Aristides offers his own explanation of what Pindar meant, adapting the poet's words to the context of his argument:

He assumes that Pindar has contrasted the *inferior* (τὸ [πολλῶ] χειρόν) to the *best* (κράτιστον) by using the word “τῶν πολλῶν”, for according to the orator's interpretation, the “*best*” belongs to the few (τὸ μὲν κράτιστον ἐν τοῖς ὀλίγοις), the “*worse*” to the many (ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς).

Aristides with the word κράτιστον meant what is φυᾶ, which was the possession of a very few and calls its opposite τὸ φαῦλον. He sees Pindar's announcement to be built on the two following antithetical pairs, which are fundamental to the poet's conception of φυᾶ:

- i. κράτιστον vs χειρόν, φαῦλον
- ii. ὀλίγοι vs πολλοί.

The nearest approach to this antithesis between the (worthier) ὀλίγοι and the φαυλότεροι πολλοί in earlier literature is at Pindar *Ol.* II.85: φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν, ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐρμανέων χατίζει. Aristides no doubt knew this passage and may have had it in mind when he commented on *Ol.* IX.100-2. The association of the poet with the intellectual *élite*, the συνετοί, as opposed to the “crowd” (τὸ πᾶν),³⁶ must have appealed to the orator. I can see him being very selective in quarrying all these excerpts from his copy of the *Olympian odes*, moving from one point to another within *Ol.* II, and IX.³⁷

³⁶ Gildersleeve (*ad loc.*) interpreted ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν as “for the general”, “for the crowd” and he sees the equation τὸ πᾶν = οἱ πολλοί occurring only here. Readers since the Hellenistic time naturally understand ἐς δὲ τὸ πᾶν as ‘for the masses’ thinking that Pindar shows disdain for the unlettered masses, cf. schol. *Ol.* II.152c ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος οὕτω· διάδηλά φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος τοῖς συνετοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι, εἰς δὲ τὸ κοινὸν ἀγόμενα ἐρμηνέως χρήζειν τοῦ σαφηνίζοντος αὐτὰ, ὡς οὐ πᾶσι καταδήλως φράζων. Some modern critics (cf. Most 1986: 306-8), think that this use of τὸ πᾶν is unparalleled. Willcock (*ad loc.*) propounds the translation “in general”; on the contrary Kirkwood translates ‘for men in general’ (*ad loc.*).

³⁷ I think Aristides quoted from his copy of Pindar rather than from an anthology: firstly he quoted *Ol.* II.86-8, then he moves to *Ol.* IX quoting *Il.* 100-2 before the quotation of *Il.* 27-9.

Aristides at §110 cites *Ol.* IX.100-2 with little variation:

<i>Ol.</i> IX.100-2 in Aristides	Pindar's <i>Ol.</i> IX.100-2
Τὸ δὲ φυᾷ κράτιστον ἅπαν. πολλοὶ δὲ διδακταῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς κλέος ᾤρουσαν αἰρεῖσθαι,	τὸ δὲ φυᾷ κράτιστον ἅπαν· πολλοὶ δὲ διδακταῖς ἀνθρώπων ἀρεταῖς κλέος ᾤρουσαν ἀρέσθαι·
4 ᾤρουσαν V ἀρέσθαι Pindari cod. A ; super αἰρεῖσθαι add. λαβεῖν R ²	102 ἀρέσθαι A, αἰρεῖσθαι Aristid., ἀνελέσθαι α, ἐλέσθαι <i>recc.</i>

αἰρεῖσθαι “to take for oneself” and ἀρέσθαι (from ἄρνημαι) “to gain / win”,³⁸ are sufficiently close in meaning for Aristides to replace one by the other, so we can explain his variant as a substitution of the poetic form with one from the prose which looked similar.³⁹

His reading has also an additional value which enables the critic of the text to check on corruption introduced by medieval copyists into the text of Pindar: ἐλέσθαι (Pind. *recc.*) is a scribal error involving progressive corruption (see *apparatus criticus*).

³⁸. Cf. κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἄροιτο *Il.* 5.3; κῦδος ἀρέσθαι *Il.* 9.303; *Nem.* IX.46.

³⁹. Ἄρνημαι is mainly employed in the epic (*Il.* 12.407; *Od.* 22.253), in the tragic tradition, and in Pindar; it is unattested in later prose writers.

III.1.1 Aristid. 2, 110 (1,179 L.-B.) = Pind. Ol. IX.27-9.

II. (XLV D.) ΠΡΟΣ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΡΗΤΟΡΙΚΗΣ.

καὶ | ἔτι πρὸ τούτων «Ἀγαθοὶ δὲ φύσει καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμονα ἄνδρες |
 ἐγένοντο,» ὁμοιον καὶ τοῦτο τῷ ἐτέρῳ ῥήματι καὶ ταῦτόν λέγων. οὐ | μὲν 10
 γὰρ διδασκταῖς εἶπεν ἀρεταῖς, προσέθηκεν ἀνθρώπων, οὐ δὲ τὴν | φύσιν
 πρεσβεύει, κατὰ δαίμονα, τούτους εἶναι τοὺς τῷ ὄντι ἀγαθοὺς καὶ | σοφούς.
 111 εἰκότως· εἰ γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς λόγοις τοὺς τὰ ὑφ' ἐτέρου | εἰρημένα καὶ
 προκατειλημμένα κλέπτοντας καὶ διεξιόντας ὡς αὐτῶν | οὐδεὶς οὕτω 15
 μαίνεται ὥστε βελτίους ἡγεῖσθαι τῶν οἰκοθεν εὐπόρων καὶ | γονίμων εἰς
 τοὺς λόγους, ἀλλ' οὗτος κράτιστος παρ' ὅτῳ πλεῖστον ἔστιν | εὐρεῖν τὰ
 δέοντα, πῶς οὐ γελοῖον καὶ πάσης ἀλογίας μεστὸν τὸν ἐξ | ἀρχῆς παρ'
 ἄλλων ἀκούσαντα καὶ μαθόντα ὅ τι χρὴ λέγειν θεῖναί ποτ' | ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ
 φύσει κρείττονος.

(Aristid. 2,110-1 (1,179 L.-B.))

καὶ ἔτι πρὸ τούτων:

That Aristides had a most detailed knowledge of Pindar's *Olympians* is shown when he asserts that ἐτέρωθι δ' αὖ βραχύτερον μὲν, γνωρίμως δ' οὐχ ἥττον διαμαρτύρεται or, more explicitly when quoting *Ol. IX.27-9* immediately after *Ol. IX.100-2*, he acknowledges explicitly the normal sequence of the quoted lines in the context of the ninth *Olympian ode*: (καὶ ἔτι πρὸ τούτων [*and furthermore, before this*]).⁴⁰ This shows direct acquaintance with the text of *Ol. IX* which Aristides had probably studied further in his oratory studies. His evidence is indispensable to us in determining the type of the source Aristides used in his quotes from Pindar. The text of Pindar itself is the immediate source of his quotations, since he points out explicitly their succession in *Olympian IX*. However, he committed the kind of error that one almost

⁴⁰ It is worth noticing that Aristides before at §91 after a series of 16 quotes from *Odyssey* introduces his last one (*Od. 8.499*) with: φησὶ [*secl. Homer*] γοῦν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν (: *for he says at the end*). This consists an indirect acknowledgement of the position of the quoted extracts within the corpus of the eighth rhapsody. Thus, it seems possible that Aristides quotes directly from the Homeric text, and for the additional reason that he cites ten quotes from books 8 and 3 in successive order. Aristides clearly quotes Homeric verses *not* out of their context. So, citing *Od. 22.347-9* states briefly its context: ἐν τῇ τῶν μνηστήρων σφαγῇ. Whereas the expression Ἐτι τοίνυν, ἀναλήψομαι γάρ, τὸν Τηλέμαχον... serves as a transition from his eight quotes of the book 8 of *Odyssey* to the following ones from book 3.

always makes in adapting a series of quotes into his speech, although he had metre to steady him to a certain extent.

Aristides inserts φύσει after ἀγαθοὶ δέ; unless this is due to an interpolator who added φύσει as a gloss to explain κατὰ δαίμονα (anticipating Aristides' own phrase, οὗ δὲ τὴν φύσιν πρεσβεύει, κατὰ δαίμονα). Aristides may have been thinking of that very famous line *Ol.* II.86 σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυᾶ.

At any rate, the quote as a whole, verging on the proverbial, functions as a transitional formula between the quote of *Ol.* IX.100-2 and *fr.**38.

Pindar *Ol.* IX.27

Pindar in a break-off formula interrupts his praise to his φίλαν πόλιν Opus interjecting the gnomic statement:

OLYMPIA IX (466)

		ἀγαθοὶ	27
	δὲ καὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ δαίμον' ἄνδρες		
) — B'	ἐγένοντ'.		

(*Ol.* IX.27-9).

These words in Pindar's context are evidently meant to apply to men in general.⁴¹ The scholiasts on Pindar took the phrase to mean ἀγαθοί, φησιν, ἄνδρες κατὰ ἀνδρείαν καὶ ἰσοφοὶ κατὰ σύνεσιν ἐκ θεοῦ μοίρας ἐγένοντο (*schol.* *Ol.* IX.42), and this has been accepted by most modern scholars, and no doubt rightly, for κατὰ δαίμονα naturally means “*in accordance with divine will*”. This expresses Pindar's belief, that all our virtues come from the gods.

Aristides relates his third quote to the second considering that both carry the same meaning:

(110) “*He means [ll. 27-9] just the same as in the other quotation [ll. 100-2]. For when he spoke of “taught virtues”, he added “of mankind”, but when he praises nature, he adds that they who are truly brave and wise are so through god*”.

⁴¹. 'Αγαθοί in the sense of valorous and bold, cf. scholion *ad loc.*: Pindar tested his allegation on the behaviour of Heracles.

The orator employing Pindar's poetry wants to illustrate what he considers 'naturally superior man', namely he who is ἀγαθὸς φύσει and has wisdom through the god's inspiration.

Aristides' interpretation generally agrees with Pindar's conception that valour and wisdom come from a divine source. Moreover, Aristides finds applicable this Pindaric principle to the field of the oratory. He considers as mere absurdity the fact that those men who have plagiarised and learnt from others should be ranked before the φύσει κρείττονων. Aristides made this quotation a matter of literary criticism by making a hit at certain rhetorical rivals, κλέπτοντας καὶ διεξιόντας ὥς αὐτῶν, contrasting them to the εὐπόρων καὶ γονίμων εἰς τοὺς λόγους.⁴² I think that Aristides' classification of what Pindar considered as "best" and "inferior" is a reminiscence of what Aristides did before in quoting Hesiod's views.

(111) *"Reasonably. For if in oratory no one is so mad as to believe that those who plagiarize and narrate as their own what has been said and anticipated by another are superior to those naturally articulate and eloquent, but that that man is best who is most able to conceive of necessary ideas, is it not silly and absurd to rank before the naturally superior him who at the start has heard and learned from others what must be said?"*.

The form in which Aristides quotes Pindar, is a literary contrivance through which the orator highlights the essential gnomic point of the quote, *i.e.* the superiority of natural ability to acquired learning, while putting forward the assumption that the true and superior ῥήτωρ is self-taught as Pindar claims to be himself.⁴³

⁴². From this point of view Aristides follows the Alexandrian scholarship in associating Pindar's passage with matters of poetical rivalry; cf. also §109 where the orator made an indirect attack to his opponents.

⁴³. Cf. schol. *Ol.* IX.152d εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ αἰνίττεται· αἰεὶ γὰρ ἑαυτὸν λέγει αὐτοδίδακτον.

III.1.1 Aristid. 2, 112 (1,179 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr.*38.

II. (XLV D.) ΠΡΟΣ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΡΗΤΟΡΙΚΗΣ.

- 112 οὐκ ἔξω δ' ἴσταται τῆς ὅλης μαρτυρίας | οὐδὲ τόδε «Ἐν ἔργοισι δὲ νικᾷ 20
τύχα, οὐ σθένης» <τὸ μὲν σθένης> | πρὸς τῆς τέχνης τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης, τὴν
δὲ τύχην πρὸς τῆς θείας μοίρας εἰ λάβοις.
- 113 Καίτοι εἰ ποιηταὶ μὲν οὐ τέχνη ποιοῦντες, ὥς φησιν ὁ Πλάτων, ἀλλ' | 1
ἐκ θεοῦ τυγχάνοντες παιδεύουσι τοὺς ἐπιγιγνομένους, οὐ μόνον τοὺς | καθ'
ἑαυτοὺς, παιδεύοντες δὲ μαρτύρονται καὶ διορίζονται τοῦ μηδενὸς | ἀξίαν
εἶναι τὴν τέχνην πρὸς τὸ τῆς φύσεως κράτος καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν·

(Aristid. 2,112-3 (1,179-80 L.-B.))

The “Ἐν ἔργοισι δὲ νικᾷ τύχα, οὐ σθένης” is a proverbial phrase having clearly the form of direct citation⁴⁴ which is not difficult to distinguish from the context. These words are Pindar's and may well have come from a hymn, but this is not certain, nor can we say to whom it was addressed due to the scantiness of the preserved lines or whether Pindar indeed had employed these fragmentary lines in a context similar to Aristides'. Aristides is our unique source for *fr.*38*, which he quotes for a second time almost 15 years later in *Or. III* in the same reading and word order stating explicitly its authorship.

Aristides introduces *fr.*38* as not irrelevant to the body of the testimony and connects it with the discussion about the omnipotence of the God. He gives immediately after his citation his own paraphrase of Pindar's words, stating that σθένης is the product of human τέχνη, whereas τύχη emanates by analogy from divine dispensation.

Concluding, we can say that in three out of the above four quotations, the notion of the preponderance and omnipotence of the Gods over all humans is stressed explicitly. *Or. II* (where these four quotes are preserved) and *Or. XXVIII* (where only the first quotation *Ol. II. 86-8* is cited again), are marked by his deep commitment to oratory. Both *orations* come from the time of Cathedra, a period in which Aristides believed that

⁴⁴. Cf. the introductory phrase: οὐκ ἔξω δ' ἴσταται τῆς ὅλης μαρτυρίας οὐδὲ τόδε. The τόδε is often found introducing comments and excerpts in the form of quotation.

his career was due to Asclepius' favour. The connection of human σοφία with god's power as illustrated by Pindar forms the base on which Aristides propounds the divine descent of the ῥητορική τέχνη.

III.I.I Aristid. 3, 466 (1,451 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr.*38.

Aristides' context

Aristides illustrates the weakness of human nature by examples of Homeric heroes in athletic games. He points out that in these games a famous hero (Achilles) and an athlete (Polydamas) were finally defeated by weaker opponents, however, it did not eventually deprive them of their reputation. The application of this principle to the realm of art is claimed by Aristides at §466, who quotes Pindar:

*Ἐν ἔργμασι⁴⁵ δὲ νικᾷ τύχα, οὐ σθένος (fr.*38).*

The truthfulness of Pindar's words is further emphasised with references to tragic poets (§466). Philocles defeated Sophocles' *Oedipus* before an Athenian audience but without depriving him of his fame.

III. (XLVI D.) ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΤΤΑΡΩΝ.

465 δηλοῖ δ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἡ τῶν Ὀλυμπίων | θεωρία, πλεῖστον αἰὲ τὸ παράδοξον
φέρουσα, οἷον ἀμέλει καὶ τὸ τοῦ | Πολυδάμαντός ποτέ φασι συμβῆναι. ἐκεῖνος
γὰρ τὰ μὲν ἄρματα ἴστη τρέλχοντα, Ὀλυμπίασι δ' ἡττήθη μικροῦ τινος
ἀνταγωνιστοῦ. ἀλλ' οὐ τί γε | τοῖς ὅλοις οἶμαι Πολυδάμας ἐκείνου χείρων, 20
466 οὐδὲ τῆς πάσης δόξης παρὰ | τοῦτο στέροιτ' ἂν δικαίως. καὶ οὐκ ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν
ἀθλητῶν οὕτως συμβαίνει, | τὰ δὲ τῆς μουσικῆς ἐστηκυῖαν ἔχει τὴν νίκην τοῖς
κρείττοσιν, ἀλλὰ | κάνταῦθα τὸ τοῦ Πινδάρου κρατεῖ. πάννυ γὰρ μετ'
ἀληθείας τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνος | ὕμνησεν· ἐν ἔργμασι δὲ νικᾷ τύχα, οὐ σθένος.
Σοφοκλῆς Φιλοκλέους | ἡττᾶτο ἐν Ἀθηναίοις τὸν Οἰδίπουν, ὧς Ζεῦ καὶ θεοί,
πρὸς ὃν οὐδ' Αἰσχύλος | εἶχε λέξαι τι. ἄρ' οὖν διὰ τοῦτο χείρων Σοφοκλῆς 5
Φιλοκλέους; αἰσχύνη | μὲν οὖν αὐτῷ τοσοῦτον ἀκοῦσαι, ὅτι βελτίων
467 Φιλοκλέους. ἄλλα μυρία ἂν | τις ἔχοι λέγειν, ἀλλ' Ὅμηρος πῶς ἐξαγγέλλει
τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν ἐπὶ Πα|τρόκλῳ γενέσθαι;

(Aristid. 3,465-467 (1,450-451 L.-B.))

Aristides quoted the same fragment in exactly the same version in *Or. II*. By comparison, his quotation in *Or. II* is mainly characterised by his endeavour to incorporate it more effectively into his argument, offering his own explanation of what

⁴⁵. ἔρμασιν Christ: τέρμασιν Bornemann 1892: 268-91.

Pindar meant. On the other hand in *Or.* III he confines himself to observing that Pindar's words are applicable to his case at issue, without saying much about its original context.

The verb ὑμνησεν, with which Aristides introduces the quotation, does not necessarily mean that he quotes it from one of Pindar's *Hymns*. It should be also noticed that the scholia use the terms 'ῥυμνος', 'ῥυμνεῖ' without a specific reference to literary genre.⁴⁶

The proverbial character of *fr.*38* may suggest that it was included in a gnomic anthology containing selections on 'Tyche', such as Stobaeus I 6-7. Such an anthology is preserved in a second century BC papyrus, edited by Barns (1950). The quotations have a common subject — *Τύχη* and its relation to human life. The extant three columns contain iambic γνῶμαι, Menander's *sententiae*, Euripides, and prose quotations. It seems possible that Pindar's line was included in such a collection.

The text of Pindar in the *Ors.* I, III and XXVIII of Aristides

Aristides in *Or.* II.110-2 quotes four separate extracts, amounting to about thirteen lines of Pindaric text, so we can form an idea of what his text was like. For the first three *Epinician* quotations we have Mss support and therefore we may check his accuracy, whereas for the fourth one Aristides constitutes our unique testimony.

Attempting a critical appreciation of these four quotations, we can say that Aristides quotes rather freely especially in:

1. Introducing the word [φύσει] in *Ol.* IX.28;
2. He preserves two *variae lectiones* at γαρεύετον and αἰρεῖσθαι.

Aristides' quotations appear more or less neutral as between the two medieval traditions of Pindar for *Olympians* II and IX. His first two quotations show no consistent tendency to side with one Pindaric medieval family against the other. His tradition does not agree in errors against ACNE:

- a. *Ol.* II.86-8: A¹C^bN = ὄρνιθα : ὄρνιχα Aristid.;
AE^{ac} = λαῦροι : λάβροι Aristid.
- b. *Ol.* IX.100-2: α = ἀνελέσθαι : αἰρεῖσθαι Aristid.

⁴⁶. Cf. schol. *Od.* 1.54.2 Πίνδαρος...ἐν ἀρχῇ... ῥυμνου ἔκτου (*Ol.* VI.); cf. schol. *Ol.* II.4a.

However, even if one does not take into consideration the insertion of the word φύσει and even if allowance is made for the variant αἰρεῖσθαι, nonetheless his tradition is of ancient authority since he preserves the true readings against some Mss at *Ol.* II.88 ὄρνιχα and at *id.* 86 λάβροι. (At *Ol.* II.86, λαῦροι is only in 2 Mss [in one of them corrected], in 88 ὄρνιθα in 8 Mss [in A corrected], but ὄρνιχα in the vast majority).

Aristides' interpretation of Pindaric quotations

The three Pindaric quotations are interrelated through the basic conception that wisdom out of nature emanates from the divine sphere.

Aristides' interest was primarily in the systematic collection of all the relevant extracts he could find from Pindar's poetry which he presented as evidence to support his argument (cf. §109 παρασχέσομαι μαρτυρίαν). This means that the quoted extracts should be in a logical sequence and cohesion. A closer examination suggests that the coherence between the first pair of quotes is clearer and the transition is natural and carefully motivated, since the presence of φνῆ functions as a cohesive link.

The ensuing couple of quotes (*Ol.* IX.27-9 & *fr.* *38) are introduced as part of the whole μαρτυρία, and Aristides finds them coherent with the others. As we have argued they are an integral part of Aristides' argumentation, and function as corroborative evidence which contributes to the better adaptation of the first couple of quotes into his speech. Aristides' intention is to show that all his four quotes from Pindar share the general principle that all human σοφία and κλέος emanate from the gods.

III.1.2 Aristid. 2, 148 (1,189 L.-B.) = Pind. Pyth. VIII.95.

Sextus Empiricus devotes the greatest part of his *Rhet.* to proving that ῥητορικὴ is not an art. Aristides who was faced with the same question in his *Or.* II (only §§135-177 deal with this issue), concludes that his profession is an art and, indeed, the apogee of the arts.

Sextus concludes the first section of his *Rhet.* (§§2-8) by giving a summary of previous definitions of rhetoric formulated by ancient philosophers,¹ attempting to prove that none of them holds true; on the other hand Aristides' starting point is Plato's disparaging remarks against rhetoric.

Plato in *Gorgias* 465a, regards rhetoric as an irrational activity because it has no deep knowledge of the matters with which it deals but proceeds only by guessing and uses conjecture (στοχασσάμενη, *Grg.* 464c). It is not an art but a form of κολακεία, an empirical activity (ἐμπειρία). He asserts that flattery can not explain the real nature of the things it aims at, or the relation between cause and result.

According to Plato's reasoning ῥητορικὴ is not an artistic practice² but a shadow of one part³ of politics: ἔστιν γὰρ ἡ ῥητορικὴ ... πολιτικῆς μορίου εἰδωλον (*Grg.* 463d1-2). Therefore, oratory is a spurious art and its relation to political art is illustrated in derogatory terms as being "the counterfeit of one branch of politics". Plato bases his argumentation on the relation between image and reality which implies a contrast between the genuine and the spurious.⁴

Aristides' context

Aristides does not call into question Plato's statement that rhetoric employs conjecture but he accepts it and attempts to prove that making guesses or using conjecture means using reason (§139); therefore Plato's assertion is self-contradictory. Aristides uses στοχάζεσθαι in its meaning "to take aim",⁵ which in §§139-40 he connects with success. The ultimate conclusion is that rhetoric mainly preserves reason in 'taking aim'. Further Aristides considers some other arts as examples and tries to prove that these arts also use

1. I.e. Plato, Aristotle, Xenocrates, Stoics; see Karadimas 1996: 51, 136-7.

2. εἶναι τι ἐπιτήδευμα τεχνικὸν μὲν οὐ (*Grg.* 463a6-7), cf. Aristid. §22.20.

3. For the meaning of μόριον cf. Arist. *Metaph.* 1023^b εἰς ἃ τὸ εἶδος διαίρεθῃ ἀν...λέγεται μόρια τούτου.

4. Socrates in *Gorgias* (464b-465e) employing the method of διαίρεσις, makes a distinction between true and false τέχναι. There are two genuine arts which minister to the body and two which minister to the mind, but each of these four has its *spurious imitation* (εἰδωλον), which is a form of κολακεία.

5. Aristides also uses στοχάζεσθαι in its second meaning: "make guesses", "use conjecture". Both meanings are attested in the relevant passage of *Gorgias* (465a; 464c); cf. Karadimas 1996: 146 n.284.

conjecture: archery (§§141-2), navigation (§§143-8), gymnastics and medicine (§§149-56), painting (§§157-62), divination (§§163-71), and strategy (§§171-3). Throughout his long treatise Aristides often compares ῥητορικὴ with other fields of human activity that were commonly assumed to be arts – attempting a number of subtle comparisons between them and his profession – in order to draw conclusions supporting rhetoric as τέχνη.⁶

The art of navigation is discussed in §§143-8, which functions in the same way as archery: it aims at saving people from the sea, as archery aims at hitting the target. Navigation like archery uses conjecture especially when it aims at an invisible place. In this case it is necessary to conjecture through the exercise of reason (εἰκάσαι τῷ λογισμῷ), to inquire about their position and get supplementary help, until their final destination comes into view and then they aim at what is seen (§§144-6).

II. (XLV D.) ΠΡΟΣ ΠΛΑΤΩΝΑ ΥΠΕΡ ΡΗΤΟΡΙΚΗΣ.

- 147 οὐχ | οἱ γε ἀκριβεῖς, ἐρεῖς. τίς δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀκριβὴς ἢ διαρκής; οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ |
τεχνίτης οὐδεὶς τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ. εἰ δὲ τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχει, τί δεινόν, εἰ μηδὲ | 5
- 148 ῥήτωρ τεχνίτης διαρκὴς μηδεὶς; καὶ μὴν εἰ μὲν τὸ κυβερνᾶν τέχνη, κἂν |
ἐπὶ τοῦ κεκλημένου κυβερνήτου μὴ σώζεται, τί κωλύει καὶ ῥητορικὴν | τέχνην
εἶναι, κἂν παρὰ τοῖς ῥήτορσιν εἶναι φάσκουσι μὴ σώζεται; εἰ δὲ | δὴ καὶ περὶ
τούτων διαλέγη τῶν κυβερνητῶν ὧν τις πυνθάνεται παρ' | ἐτέρου τι καὶ 10
ζητεῖ, οὐ γὰρ περὶ γε τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος, οὐδὲ τῶν Νηρηίδων, | οὐδὲ τῶν
Διοσκούρων, ὅμως δ' αὐτοῖς ἀποδίδως εἶναι κυβερνήταις, ὥς | ἄνθρωπος
ἀνθρώποις, καὶ τέχνην ἔχειν τὴν κυβερνητικὴν, τούτοις | ἅπασιν ἐστὶ τὸ
στοχάζεσθαι, οἱ γε καὶ πρὶν ἀπαίρειν εὐθύς κάθηνται | στοχαζόμενοι περὶ
τῶν πνευμάτων· οὐ γὰρ παρὰ τοῦ γε Διὸς ἤκουσαν | ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰδης ἢ τοῦ 15
Γαργάρου, ἀλλ' οἶμαι ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰς τέλος στοχάζονται | ἀνέμων λιμένων εἰ
φθήσονται πάντων ὥς ἔπος εἰπεῖν. ὥστε σοι τὸ τοῦ | μορίου εἶδωλον σκιᾶς
ὄναρ εἰς ἔλεγχον κατὰ Πίνδαρον γίγνεται. |
- 149 Πρὸς Διός, ἢ δὲ τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ἀντίστροφος ἰατρικὴ σοι καὶ δεύτερον |
ἀγαθὸν τῷ σώματι, εἰ δὲ βούλει, καὶ ἡ γυμναστικὴ, πότερον οὐ στοχάζονται | 20
τῆς φύσεως τῶν σωμάτων;

(Aristid. 2,147-149 (1,189 L.-B.)

⁶. Rhetoric is generally compared to: piloting: §§ 143-8, 250-1, 362-71, 416; gymnastics: §§ 36, 149-50, 374-5; medicine: §§ 35, 62-5, 152-6, 247-9, 375, 411-2; divination: §§ 50-7, 163-71; strategy: §§ 171-3, 413-5; legislation: §§ 37, 215-21, 233, 253-6; judicial art: §§ 35, 222-6, 233.

Aristides having in mind, at §§146-7, Plato's arguments in *R.* 342a-b that a true art has no imperfection to be corrected, emphatically answers that no one is always accurate and, if Plato's argument is accepted, he assumes that no one is an artist (τεχνίτης). Further on Aristides illustrates his objection with the example of the helmsmen (§148), who are not “accurate” since they continuously need to “take aim” at specific details and also to inquire of and seek information about their position in the sea; on this argument, he questions why “*is it terrible if no orator is a satisfactory artist*”. If to be a helmsman is an art, on equal grounds Aristides asserts for oratory the right to be called art.

Aristides finds it irrational that all those who are getting involved in taking aim (στοχάζεσθαι) and conjecturing about winds and harbours, are still considered to be helmsmen and to possess the art of navigation, even if they require supplementary help. All these, according to the orator, disprove one of the parts of Plato's charge, that oratory is [*sc.* πολιτικῆς] μορίου εἰδωλον. The subjection of this statement to an examination suggests that it provides an instance of what Pindar meant by his σκιᾶς ὄναρ in *Pyth.* VIII.95. Pindar's σκιᾶς ὄναρ, regarded to be the quintessence of the unreal: a ‘shadow of a dream’, a ‘phantom dream’, functions as a part in Aristides' argumentation against Plato's charge.⁷

Even if Plato's name is not mentioned the reader can easily identify it from the quote from *Grg.* 463a-d.

Pindar *Pyth.* VIII.93-6

Pindar just before his prayer to Aegina, interrupts his account of the victories achieved by the young Aristomenes, dwelling on one of his favourite topics, the mutability of human fortune, which is presented in a pessimistic nuance.⁸

The glory and happiness that are granted to humans by the gods are transient. The impermanence of human life is illustrated by Pindar with the adjective ἐπάμερος. Fränkel, distinguishing three meanings for ἐφήμερος: a. “*subject to changes*”, b. “*lasting*

⁷. For the logic of Aristides' argument see also schol. Aristid. 3,399 Dind.; cf. below pp.194-5 with n.23.

⁸. This has been already noticed by the ancient scholia, which have questioned the appropriateness of ll.95-7 in the context of Pindar's praise towards the Aeginitean young man.

for one day”, and c. “daily, renewed with every new day”, argues that Pindar's usage of the term in l.95 pertains to the first case.⁹

PYTHIA VIII (446)

— οὕτω δὲ καὶ πίτνει χαμαί,
ἀποτρόπῳ γνώμῃ σεσεισμένον.
ἐπάμεροι· τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὐ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ 95
ἄνθρωπος. ἀλλ' ὅταν αἶγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθῃ,
λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μείλιχος αἰών.
(Pyth.VIII.93-6).

This passage is one of Pindar's most profound expressions of the generally pessimistic lyric view of life. The mortal nature is emphasised with a statement which is proverbial σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος.¹⁰ Its function is transitional, referring both to before and to the next.

Human life is depicted by Pindar as a “dream of a shadow”,¹¹ which in the poetic language implies the superlative of the unreal. The allegoric meaning of that statement is mainly concerned with the mortal transience. Therefore we can assume with Jüthner and Giannini, that σκιᾶς ὄναρ denotes an “appearance without substance”,¹² which makes the people look completely insignificant; but this is foil for ἀλλ' ὅταν αἶγλα... — the moment of radiance from the gods which illuminates human action.

Life had often been called a “shadow” and a “dream” before Pindar, but the combination of both is purely Pindar's, who according to the scholiast is εὖ τῇ ἐμφάσει χρώμενος. Various scholars see a pattern for Pindar's words in *Od.* 11.207-8:

τρίς μὲν ἐφορμήθην, ἐλέειν τέ με θυμὸς ἀνώγει,
τρίς δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ εἶκελον ἦ καὶ ὀνείρω 207
ἔπτᾱτ'.

Pindar, unlike Homer, does not refer to the people of the underworld but to living people.¹³

⁹. Schol. *Pyth.* VIII.135a διὰ τὴν μετάπτωσιν τῶν πραγμάτων.

¹⁰. The passage has been subjected to an immense amount of discussion. Cf. the works of Bieler 1970: 191-3; Jüthner 1936: 142-3; Stanford 1942: 363-4; Turolla 1955: 183-9; Segal 1976: 71-6 cf. also Giannini 1982: 69-76; and Toohey 1987: 73-87.

¹¹. We share with Bieler 1970: 190, that σκιᾶς is a subjective genitive (cf. schol. *Pyth.* VIII.135b ὀνείρατα σκιᾶς ἐσμεν οἱ ἄνθρωποι). Toohey (1987: 78, 84), translates σκιᾶς ὄναρ as “a dream ‘felt by’ a shadow”, a dream that a dead man has; is a “kind of death in life”. He also argues that this expression is part of the encomiastic argument (*ib.* 71, 84, 87).

¹². Jüthner (1936: 143), translates as “Unvorstellbaren” and “Absurden”. Giannini (1982: 74ff.), paraphrases as “apparenza senza sostanza”. This interpretation is followed by Gentili 1988: 284 n.89.

¹³. Cf. Bieler 1970: 192 n.3.

Bieler suggests that Pindar's words might be better understood if we assume that σκιά indicates something living, which can dream.¹⁴ The scholion 135a interprets it as ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι τοῦ ἀσθενοῦς τὸ ἀσθενέστερον. οὐ γὰρ οἶον ἀνθρώπου ὄναρ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ σκιᾶς ἀνθρώπου, and is in line with the scholion on *S. Aj.* 125a, 2 ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνυπάρκτου τὸ ἀνυπαρκτότερον, cf. *Sud. s.v. εἶδωλον*.

Aristides by detaching the phrase out of its original context, gives a misleading interpretation which is not what Pindar meant. Pindar says that human existence is fragile, in danger, but the important thing is when we are successful even for one time, then we are visibly favoured by the gods (αἶγλα διόσδοτος).¹⁵ Aristides does not take the following lines into consideration.

The source for Pind. *Pyth.* VIII.95

Aristides' connection of Pindar's σκιᾶς ὄναρ with *Pl. Grg.* 463d.2 (εἶδωλον) is not unparalleled. There are certain textual allusions to *Pyth.* VIII.95, which –while akin in expression– are mainly concerned with variations of the Pindaric saying, placing special emphasis on the unreality of human existence as a whole. This is depicted as εἶδωλον σκιᾶς.

This idea was shared by a number of poets before and after Pindar:

1	A. A. 839-40	ὁμιλίας κάτοπτρον, εἶδωλον σκιᾶς, δοκοῦντας εἶναι κάρτα πρενυμενείς ἐμοί·
2	S. <i>Aj.</i> 125-6	ὁρῶ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὐδὲν ὄντας ἄλλο πλὴν εἶδωλ' ὅσοι περ ζῶμεν ἢ κούφην σκιάν. (Cf. <i>Stob.</i> 3.22.20; <i>Suda s.v. εἶδωλον</i>).
3	S. <i>Ph.</i> 946-7	κούκ οἶδ' ἐναίρων νεκρόν, ἢ καπνοῦ σκιάν, εἶδωλον ἄλλως. (cf. <i>Suda s.v. Κακοπινέστατον, Καπνοῦ σκιά</i>).
4	S. <i>fr.</i> 659, 6	πλαθεῖσα δ' ἐν λειμῶνι ποταμίων ποτῶν ἴδη σκιᾶς εἶδωλον ταύγασθεῖς ὑπὸ κουραῖς ἀτίμως διατετιλμένης φόβην. Cf. also S. <i>OC</i> 109-10 οἰκτίρατ' ἀνδρὸς Οἰδίπου τόδ' ἀθλιον εἶδωλον (eadem <i>Ael. NA</i> 11.18.21).

¹⁴ Bieler 1970: 192. Toohey 1987: 78ff., advancing a similar interpretation, suggests that Pindar employed *skia* in *Pyth.* VIII as a personified abstract (like *Hesychia* l.1, or *Tyche* in *Ol.* XIII), attributing to it a concrete existence.

¹⁵ Cf. Gentili 1995: 586. Pindar does not mourn on the human *Moirai* -as the scholion 136c points out-, but he emphasises its dependence on gods' will. Cf. Iakov 1994: *ad loc.* with Segal 1976: 74.

5	Chaerem. fr. 14, 12ff.N.	ὑπνωμένοι δ' ἔπιπτον ἐλενίων ἔπι, Ἴων τε μελανόφυλλα συγκλῶσαι πτερὰ κρόκον θ', ὃς ἡλιῶδες εἰς ὑφάσματα πέπλων σκιᾶς εἰδῶλον ἐξωμόργνυτο.
---	--------------------------	--

From the above testimonies that of Sophocles is of special interest. In *Philoctetes* 947 the “shadow of smoke” indicates the ‘worthless’ (cf. Ar. V. 191 περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς [μάχεσθαι] and Pl. *Phdr.* 260c),¹⁶ and it agrees with that of Homer (*Od.* 11.207)¹⁷ and Pindar;¹⁸ he seems to have taken into account both traditions. Sophocles in *Aj.* 125-6 stresses that “all of us in our lives are nothing different from a ghost or a light shadow”.

It is noteworthy that Sophocles in all of his quotes combines together “σκιᾶ” with “εἰδῶλον”, and in this respect his tradition forms an already established model, on which Aristides draws in presenting Plato's charge as σκιᾶς ὄναρ.¹⁹ As we have seen Plato in *Grg.* 463d spoke for oratory in a derogatory fashion calling it πολιτικῆς μορίου εἰδῶλον. This was enough for Aristides to recollect the Pindaric passage. The attempted connection was facilitated apart from the tradition of Sophocles, also from Plato himself, who in the image of the cave in *R.* VII 532c, spoke in similar terms: σκιᾶς τῶν ὄντων, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰδῶλων σκιᾶς, (cf. Plut. *quaest. Platon.* 1001E).

Aristides' connection of Plato's εἰδῶλον with the Pindar quote (σκιᾶς ὄναρ) seems to have been conditioned by the tradition of the tragedy where the literary connection between εἰδῶλον and σκιά was clearly established.²⁰

The quote from Pindar was later known as a proverb,²¹ and in the XVth cent. AD it was listed among the collection of Mantiss. Prov. II 84 Σκιά ὀνείρων: ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδήλων, (cf. Macar. [AD 14], VII. 71 Σκιᾶς εἰδῶλον: ἐπὶ τοῦ σφόδρα ἀσθενοῦς). The

¹⁶. Cf. Webster 1970: *ad loc.* Aeschylus by the term εἰδῶλον σκιᾶς in Ag. 839, means the mere shape or the outline without substance or depth, and is in line with Pindar. Cf. Lawson 1932: *ad loc.*

¹⁷. Bieler 1970: 193 n.3, sees *Od.* 11.207 as a pattern for S. *Aj.* 125-6. He observes that Sophocles unlike Homer directs the words for living people and not for the underworld.

¹⁸. Cf. schol. S. *Aj.* 125a πρὸς τὸ Πινδαρικόν. Suda s.v. εἰδῶλον. Cf. Irigoin 1952: 12 with n.2.

¹⁹. Aristides was familiar with Sophocles' poetry. He quotes sixteen fragments from his poetry: *Aj.* (3); *OT* (3); *OC* (2); *Ph.* (3); *Sat.* (1); and *Frs.* (4).

²⁰. This connection is further reflected in Luc. *Fug.* 10, 9; *Iamb. Comm. Math.* 6, 196; 8, 16; schol. A. *Th.* 976d, and in Hesychius s.v. εἰδῶλον and κήνυγμα.

²¹. Cf. Eust. *Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem*, 2, p.734, 19. ὃ δοκεῖ ἐκ Πινδαρικοῦ ῥήτου παρεξέσθαι τοῦ “σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος”; cf. also schol. S. *Aj.* 125a πρὸς τὸ Πινδαρικόν; cf. Suda s.v. ἀνύπαρκτον, which reproduces the scholion 125a on S. *Aj.* *verbatim*. Cf. Suda s.v. σκιάν ὀνείρων: κατὰ Πίνδαρον.

question whether Pindar's words were included in a paroemiographical collection in a time close to Aristides – from where he might have quarried it –, admits of no certain answer and a decision here is impossible. The influence of tragedy (Sophocles) seems more persuasive.

Pindar and other archaic and classical period poets used this expression to describe the human condition. Later antiquity, since it was in no position to understand Pindar's intention, twisted the original meaning. The point of departure, as we have seen, was marked with the tragedians and Plato himself, who attempted further connections of Pindar's [σκιᾶ] with [εἶδωλον].

In Aristides' treatment, the meaning of Pindar's words is amplified becoming a matter of rhetorical criticism as he employs it as part of his polemic against Plato's charge.²² The amplification of Pindar's meaning is achieved with the equation of Plato's μορίου εἶδωλον to Pindar's σκιᾶς ὄναρ. The produced effect is that Plato's accusation looks to be unreal, groundless, and being deprived of any intrinsic substance,²³ a 'phantom dream'.

The words in their later use are quoted by Plut. *consol. Apollon.* 6 p.104B, for whom there is a strong possibility that he quoted *Pyth.* VIII.95 from an ancient commentary on Pindar, since his interpretation is in agreement with the scholion 135a.

Plut. <i>consol. Apollon.</i> 6 p.104B (post fr.207)	Schol. <i>Pyth.</i> VIII.135a
<p>ὁ δὲ Πίνδαρος ἐν ἄλλοις (<i>Pyth.</i> VIII.95sq.) 'τί δέ τις; τί δ' οὐ τις; σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωπος' ἐμφαντικῶς σφόδρα καὶ φιλοτέχνως ὑπερβολῇ χρησάμενος τὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων βίον ἐδήλωσε. τί γὰρ σκιᾶς ἀσθενέστερον; τὸ δὲ ταύτης ὄναρ οὐδ' ἂν ἐκφράσαι τις τορῶς δυνηθεῖη [σαφῶς].</p>	<p>τῶν ἐφημέρων ἀνθρώπων τί ἂν τις εἴποι ὅτι ἔστι τις, ἢ πάλιν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι; ταχέως μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἔστι τις οὗτος, ταχέως δὲ ὅτι οὐδεὶς, διὰ τὴν μετάπτωσιν τῶν πραγμάτων. διὰ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐπιφέρει, ὅτι σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἄνθρωποι, εὖ τῇ ἐμφάσει χρώμενος, ὥς ἂν τις εἴποι τοῦ ἀσθενοῦς τὸ ἀσθενέστερον. οὐ γὰρ οἶον ἀνθρώπου ὄναρ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ σκιᾶς ἀνθρώπου. BDEGQ</p>

²². Pindar's words function as a part of the encomiastic argument of the poem, aiming to praise the victor. Cf. Toohey 1987: 73ff.

²³. Cf. schol. Aristid. 3,399 Dind. καλοῦντι γὰρ τὴν ῥητορικὴν πολιτικῆς μορίου εἶδωλον ἀνυπόστατόν σοι τοῦτο εἰς τὸν αὐτῆς ἔλεγχον γίνεται· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς σκιᾶς ὄναρ. λέγει δὲ τοῦτο ὁ Πίνδαρος περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Plutarch cites the Pindaric lines among a series of quotations from Homer (*Il.* 12.327) and Euripides (*Ph.* 558; *fr.* 420.2),²⁴ illustrating the volatility that characterises the human life and happiness. This idea is also echoed in the same Pindar scholion (135a).

²⁴. Plutarch (*ibid* 104A) cites also a scholion from a Hellenistic *ὑπόμνημα* on Euripides: ὅθεν ὀρθῶς ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος... ἔφη.

III.1.3 PINDAR, NOMOS, AND ORATORY

Fr.169a.1-8, 16-7; Fr.81; Pyth.II.94-5, 96.

Few fragments of Greek poetry have been cited in ancient literature as frequently as the beginning of Pindar's poem concerned with the labours of Heracles (*fr.169a*). The opening lines became proverbial soon after Pindar composed it and remained so throughout antiquity. The quotation has been the subject of much controversy. It raises two questions:

1. What is the meaning of the lines as intended by Pindar and as interpreted by Callicles and Aristides? More specifically, what is the precise meaning of νόμος here and how does it relate to the meaning intended by (Plato's) Callicles who cites this passage in order to assist his immoralist tenets?

2. The manuscript tradition of Plato provides a variant reading which has puzzled generations of scholars. Did Plato misquote and misinterpret the crucial phrase δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον? And if so, did he do so intentionally (in order to suit his purposes to represent his opponent in a certain light) or was the misquotation simply due to a lapse in memory or was it the result of a corruption in the Mss tradition?

Both questions are closely related with Aristides' perception of Pindar's νόμος since the orator is obviously citing Pindar from *Gorgias*.

What I aim to demonstrate is that Aristides depended both on Plato's citation and on his copy of Pindar.

An analysis of Aristides' context must be preceded by a look at the context of Callicles' conversation with Socrates in *Gorgias*, as well as elsewhere in ancient sources in which the Pindaric fragment is cited. I will also focus on the concept of νόμος which, in my view, has its meaning altered by the defender of *Realpolitik*, Callicles (or, more precisely, by Plato) in the context of his argument against Socrates, since Aristides took extra pains to point out this inconsistency of Plato.

The transmission of *Fr. 169a.1-8*

For the beginning of the poem as a whole we still depend on the literary tradition and particularly that of Aristides. This text is a composite of four sources:

1. The first five lines as far as 'Ηρακλέος, ἐπεὶ are quoted in *Grg.* 484b1-c, and the next three are given in paraphrase, which includes the word ἀπριάτας and the explanation: λέγει δ' ὅτι οὔτε πριάμενος οὔτε δόντος τοῦ Γηρυόνου ἤλασατο τὰς βοῦς.

2. Pindar's text is quoted in Aristides' 'Υπέρ 'Ρητορικῆς probably from the *Grg.*

3. The rest of the clause which starts with ἐπεὶ is provided by the scholia on Aristides:

52, 10. ἐπεὶ ἀπριάτας]: τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς χρήσεως ἦν οὕτως· ἐπεὶ Γηρυόνου 20
βόας Κυκλωπείων ἐπὶ προθύρων Εὐρυσθέως συναιρεῖται.¹ καὶ ἀπριάτας
ἔλασεν. ὁ δὲ νοῦς τοιοῦτος· ἐπειδὴ τὰς τοῦ Γηρυόνου βόας οὔτε αἰτήσας οὔτε
πριάμενος ἤλασεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Εὐρυσθέως·

1 ἀναιρεῖται Oxon.

(schol. Aristid. 3, 408 Dind.)

This fragment is also partially preserved by the scholiast on *Nem.* IX.35a.

4. The publication of P.Oxy. 2450 by Lobel, from the first or early second century AD, has added more or less well preserved pieces of another thirty lines. The initial line seems to coincide with the last line of Plato's quotation and with his reference to Heracles' stealing of Geryon's cattle.¹

I. Authors quoting <i>fr.169a</i> lines 1–8			
Sources			Text
1	II.1-8	Plat. <i>Gorg.</i> 484 B. cf. <i>Leg.</i> 714 E-715 A.	δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Πίνδαρος ἅπερ ἐγὼ λέγω ἐνδείκνυσθαι ἐν τῷ ᾄσματι, ἐν ᾧ λέγει ὅτι νόμος — ἀθανάτων· οὗτος δὲ δῆ, φησὶν, ἄγει — ἀπριάτας ... ἤλασατο τὰς βοῦς.
2	II.1-8	Aristid. 2,226 (1, 208 L.-B.)	οὐ τὸν Πινδάρου νόμον τιμῶσα, ὥς τάναντία αὐτὰ λέγων τῇ φύσει τῆς ῥητορικῆς, οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἐπάδουσα «Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θανάτων τε καὶ ἀθανάτων ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον ὑπερτάτα χειρὶ. τεκμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν 'Ηρακλέος, ἐπεὶ ἀπριάτας...» οὐ γὰρ φῆς ὅλου μεμνησθαι.
3	II.1-8	Schol. Aristid.3,408 Dind.	52,10. τὰ λοιπὰ τῆς χρήσεως ἦν οὕτως· ἐπεὶ... ἤλασεν
4	II.1-4	Schol.Pind. <i>Nem.</i> IX, 35a	35a. ἐν ἀλλοις ὁ Πίνδαρος (<i>fr.</i> 169): νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θανάτων τε καὶ ἀθανάτων ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον ὑπερτάτα χειρὶ.
II. Authors quoting <i>fr.169a</i> lines 1-2			
5	II.1-2	Plut. <i>ad princ. inerud.</i> 3 p.780 C.	
6	II.1-2	Clem. Alex. <i>str.</i> 1,181,4 (111,9 St.) et 2,19,2 (122,21 St.)	

¹ Lobel 1961: 141ff. the beginning of the papyrus starts from l. 6: col. 2 ⁶ ἐπεὶ Γηρυόνα, βόας.

III. <i>Initium carminis respiciunt</i>		
7		Hdt. 3, 38, 4.
8		Pl. <i>Prt.</i> 337d; <i>Lg.</i> 690b-c; 889e- 890a.
9		Aristot. <i>rhet.</i> 3, 3 p. 1406a 22.
10		Chrysipp. <i>fr.</i> 314 (III 77,34 Arnim).
11		Plut. <i>vit. Demetr.</i> 42,8.
12		D. Chr. 75,2.
13		Orig. in Cels. 5,34 (<i>qui affert verba Herodoti a Celso laudata</i>).
14		Stob. 4, 5, 77 (Iamblichos).
15		Lib. <i>decl.</i> 1, 87 (V 62,11 Foerster).
16		Olymp. in Plat. <i>Gorg.</i> 484B (p.129, 12 Norvin).
17	6-39	Π ³³ [1st or early 2nd century AD], (6-39) <i>fr.</i> col.2, 1-34 (+ <i>fr.</i> 2 ?).

Ever since Lobel published the Oxyrhynchus papyrus, various scholars have offered differing interpretations of the fragmentary Pindaric poem as well as varied textual readings.² The poem's metrical scheme has also been a point of dispute. Placing the controversial technical aspects of the fragment aside, one can nevertheless gain some insight into Pindar's treatment of the labours of Heracles, especially with regard to the hero's unprovoked attacks on Geryon and Diomedes.

No doubt Aristides and the scholiast on *Nemean IX* offer the correct reading, but whether, and in which precise sense –Callicles misquotes Pindar is the pertinent question.

Before one can comment upon Aristides' use of the Pindaric quotation, one must determine what Pindar meant by the gnomic statement that νόμος is 'King of all', both human and divine.

The meaning of νόμος in Pind. *Fr.* 169a.1

Pindar resorts to the concept of νόμος in order to justify or "make just" what is "most violent" in both the human and divine spheres. He absolves Heracles from any wrongdoing by appealing to νόμος.

². A full bibliography of pre-1956 treatments can be found throughout Gigante 1956: 79-92; Some of the most helpful detailed discussions of *fr.* 169a are: Page 1962; Lloyd-Jones 1972; Ostwald 1965, (repr. 1970); Pavese 1964, 1968, 1975/76; Theiler 1965; Gigante 1966, 1968; Castagna 1971; Treu 1963; Bornmann 1978; Mette 1962, (repr. 1988); Pini 1974; Alderisio 1960; Gennaro 1951; Plezia 1971.

FR. 169a (151)

A'	Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων ἅγει δικαίων τὸ βαιότατον ὑπερτάτῃ χειρὶ τεκμαίρομαι	5
col. 2	ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος· ἔπει Γηρυόνα βόας Κυκλώπειον ἐπὶ πρόθυρο ἱνὶ Εὐρύσιθεός ἀνατεί τε] καὶ ἀπριάτας ἔλασεν,	

Scholars' opinions have widely differed on interpreting Pindar's νόμος. One line of interpretation, widely favoured in the scholarly tradition, is rather akin to Herodotus' understanding of Pindar's passage, well known already among his contemporaries. Herodotus, contemporary of Pindar, appeals to the poet's gnome regarding νόμος as the 'king of all' in his recounting of the contrast between the burial rites of the Greeks and the Indic Kallatiae (*Histories* 3.38). Herodotus is illustrating his observation that every race prefers its own 'customs' over those of others. While Greeks burn the corpses of their fathers, the Kallatiae eat them. Both the Greeks and the Kallatiae expressed outrage at one another's practices. Herodotus then concludes:

οὕτω μὲν νυν ταῦτα νενόμισται, καὶ ὀρθῶς μοι δοκεῖ Πίνδαρος ποιῆσαι νόμον πάντων βασιλέα φήσας εἶναι. (3.38).

It is by no means certain that Pindar meant by νόμος what the historian intends by it, but scholars like Martin Ostwald believe that Herodotus' interpretation of Pindar is correct. According to Ostwald νόμος in its original context and in the Herodotean passage, refers to "a traditional attitude which implies deep seated convictions and beliefs".³ This 'relativist' view was strongly contested by Marcello Gigante who sees in Pindar's νόμος a more absolute and primordial reign, of divine stature, that holds the world under its rule ("la legge che viene da Zeus, la legge divina universale che regge la storia del mondo").⁴ More particularly, Gigante sees Orphic and Pythagorean overtones in Pindar's conception of νόμος.⁵ Herodotus is simply quoting Pindar out of context,

³ Ostwald 1965: 124.

⁴ Gigante 1956: 111. He gives an ample discussion of the matter (92): "*Nomos è il principio assoluto della divinità*". His argument is based essentially upon Sol. 24.15f D³, and Heracl. fr. B114 (28ff., 50ff.).

⁵ Gigante (1956: 75), is just one of many scholars who have postulated Orphic influences; cf. Dodds' argument (1990: 270): "*H.Orph.* 64 is much too late to be trustworthy evidence".

tailored to suit his own generalisations regarding the attitudes of men to their particular customs and rites.

Subsequent discussion has moved along the lines sketched above, forming two opposed groups of interpreters:

1. The first group understands νόμος in the sense of 'custom' or 'usage'. Already before the publication of the papyrus, this interpretation was favoured by Wilamowitz, Ehrenberg and Pohlenz.⁶ It maintained, broadly, that while the action in itself was unjust, we are "used" to consider Heracles as good and Diomedes as bad. After the publication of the papyrus, Theiler and Bowra defended Wilamowitz' view while, as noted already, Ostwald threw his weight behind it by arguing that νόμος denotes "the attitude traditionally or conventionally taken to a norm",⁷ thus seeing the power of νόμος as "absolute, unchallengeable, and legitimate"⁸: it is unchallengeable, inasmuch as people's deepest rooted traditions are.

2. The other view understands νόμος to signify the law of the universe, or more particularly the law of Zeus. Schroeder⁹ argues that νόμος here comes close to the meaning of μοῖρα or ἀνάγκη, meaning in effect "a male goddess of fate". Quite similar was the view defended by Stier.¹⁰ He thought νόμος meant an "inviolable" order, which dominates the belief and will of gods and men.

In more recent times this kind of view was upheld by Lesky (1950). Along with Gigante (1956), quoted above, Dodds (1959) adopts a similar view, and so does Treu in 1963 as well as Guthrie in 1969. Gigante's view is also favoured by Lloyd-Jones, who goes one step further, by personifying this all powerful will as the will of Zeus: "law was identical with the will of Zeus".¹¹

Hugh Lloyd-Jones' interpretation is commendable in that he judges the question of the precise significance of Zeus' νόμος as "νόμος king of all" by reference to Pindar's

⁶. Wilamowitz 1920a: vol.II.95ff.; Ehrenberg 1921: 119ff.; Pohlenz 1948: 139.

⁷. Ostwald 1965: 134.

⁸. *Ibid.* 125-6.

⁹. Schroeder 1917: 202.

¹⁰. Stier 1928: 227ff. A summary presentation of these views, contrasted to the other line of argument, is presented in Lloyd-Jones 1972.

¹¹. Lloyd-Jones 1972: 56; 1971: 51; cf. Dodds 1990: 270.

own attitudes implicit in the wider context of his work as well as the surrounding moral and political climate reflected in his work.

First, Pindar adheres to and shares with his public a religious belief which honours Heracles as a great benefactor of human kind. In fighting monstrous threats, as represented by Geryon and Diomedes he is not only executing Eurystheus' orders, he is also carrying out the will of Zeus, the universal law, which is contested by those monsters. In the *First Nemean Ode*, the blind seer Tiresias foretells how many monsters, ignorant of justice and in this sense “outside the law”, Heracles will slay: like the Cyclopes and Laistrygones in Homer, these monsters lie outside the “θέμιστες” and he who vanquishes them is glorified as enforcing Zeus' will. While clashing with the Greek belief that the initiator of aggression is unjust, Heracles is acting justly by delivering his unprovoked attack because he is carrying out Zeus' will. In a sense, these monsters are themselves unjust, prior to Heracles' attack, because they defy the universal moral order of Zeus' will, and Heracles is glorified in enforcing and extending “νόμος—the-king” to all premises on earth. To act in accordance with Zeus' will is to act justly, *in all cases*, and this is a primordial “fundamental of law and morality” truth Pindar accepts and is not willing to contest.

Hugh Lloyd-Jones argues that this primordial νόμος, controlling everything in the universe, including gods and humans, is what Themis and Dike would have been taken traditionally, before the fifth century, to represent in this context.¹² However, with the development of polis and democracy in Athens, and with them of civil notions of law and law-abiding, we see at the same time the praises to Zeus' Law being sung.¹³ In the historical context of the development of polis it is the sanctity of Law as ruler of human (and divine) affairs that is sanctioned by reference to the Will (thus Law) of Zeus.

Along with Aeschylus, as subtly portrayed in the *Oresteia* trilogy (Athena's sanctioning of the rule of courts in *Eumenides*), Pindar would seem to extol the *divine* sanctioning of

¹². He does not agree with finding Orphic elements in the identification of Divine Law with Zeus' will, (1972: 56).

¹³. Already in Hesiod, Eunomia and Dike and Eirene are counted among the Horai (*Th.* 902), daughters of Zeus and Themis, and as such she is prominent in Pindar's *Olympian* XIII.6-8, where Pindar praises the *laudandus'* city (Corinth).

the civil institutions of law and order, like as apportioned by courts and civil assemblies. Also along with Sophocles, and Heraclitus, he would have proclaimed that “all human laws are nurtured by one divine law”. Thus, he would have played deaf ear to some of his contemporaries contrasting “natural law” to “human conventional law”.¹⁴ Because Law, for Pindar, was identical with the will of Zeus, as something powerful and inevitable, which holds sway over everything.¹⁵

Pindar's conception of the universal and unviolable rule of “νόμος” as identical to Zeus' will is actually entrenched, and more insight is gained in the notion of νόμος as the universal moral order, when we attempt to resolve the paradox, pointed out, among others by Guthrie, that since Pindar's words explicitly state that νόμος is king of all, both mortals and immortals, Zeus himself, therefore, is implied to be subject to the power of νόμος.¹⁶ But how can one see Zeus being subject to νόμος, when this νόμος is sanctioned as being identical to his will?¹⁷

Zeus is indeed, in a sense, subject to νόμος “*king of gods and mortals*”, the law of the universe understood as identical to Zeus' will. But not in the sense Guthrie understands the argument to imply, that is, that Zeus is subject to this law of the universe, but in the sense that he is also “his own law”. Zeus' will orders the universe in a set unviolable order, and his “settled policy” fixes the world's ticking in an orderly fashion because he himself would decline to unsettle his own design by following sudden whims, as *e.g.* he would have done if he were to follow his understandable urgency to save his son Sarpedon from death (in the *Iliad*). He obeys his own rules and he is his own Law in the sense that his rule of the world order, his νόμος, is coherent, meaningful and universal and not whimsical, disorderly and self-contradicting. To act according to Zeus's will is to act justly: Heracles is acting justly, even when he is perceived to act as

¹⁴. Suggested by Lloyd-Jones 1972: 56.

¹⁵. The personification of abstract concepts such as “war”, “time”, or “love” is not uncommon in Greek literary thought. Pindar's wording implies that Zeus himself, (one of the immortals) is ruled by νόμος.

¹⁶. Although Guthrie (1969: 133) is right to point this out, his suggestion that νόμος be translated as recognised custom (usage, tradition) does not clarify Pindar's meaning of the term. Surely Pindar would not think that the violent acts of Heracles are somehow customary; cf. Dodds 1990: 270.

¹⁷. Guthrie 1969: (III), 133.

an aggressor against Geryon and Diomedes because he is acting to enforce Zeus' will and thus reassert the universal order.

A reference is due, finally, to Demos'¹⁸ very succinct presentation of the two rival schools in interpreting Pindar's conception of νόμος. I have benefited from her insightful interpretation, but I would think that her own position, taking cue from Crotty,¹⁹ to detect an ambiguity in Pindar's notion of νόμος, which appears to her to refer to both “divine law” and “social usage” is inconclusive and somewhat over accommodating. The fact that a notion has been proved (historically) to be inherently ambiguous does not by itself imply that a particular use by an author is itself ambiguous or that he himself “finds it to be ambiguous”.²⁰

Gorgias 484b1-c

In the controversy νόμος and φύσις the passage became a familiar quotation and its meaning was distorted for controversial purposes. Socrates' interlocutor in his ῥῆσις presenting a forceful challenge not only to Socrates' views but also to conventional notions of justice, builds his argument on the antithesis between φύσις and νόμος, which appears frequently in the Greek literature of the fifth and fourth centuries.²¹

Callicles thinks that weaker segments of society impose the “laws” (νόμοι) as a means of restraining the strongest and protecting themselves. They are content to be on an equal footing with the stronger considering πλέον ἔχειν equal to ἀδικεῖν (483c7-9).

Διὰ ταῦτα δὴ νόμῳ μὲν τοῦτο ἄδικον καὶ αἰσχρὸν λέγεται, | τὸ πλέον ζητεῖν
ἔχειν τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ ἀδικεῖν αὐτὸ | καλοῦσιν· ἡ δέ γε οἶμαι φύσις αὐτῇ
ἀποφαίνει αὐτό, ὅτι | δίκαιόν ἐστιν, τὸν ἀμείνω τοῦ χείρονος πλέον ἔχειν καὶ
| τὸν δυνατώτερον τοῦ ἀδυνατωτέρου. ... ὅτι οὕτω τὸ δίκαιον κέκριται, τὸν
κρείττω τοῦ ἥττονος ἄρχειν | καὶ πλέον ἔχειν.

Grg. 483c7-d6 (Dodds)

¹⁸. Demos (1991: 63-4), suggests that Pindar used νόμος in its basic sense as “allotment” or “apportionment”, “the existing state of affairs”.

¹⁹. Crotty 1982: 104.

²⁰. I also have problems in comprehending the “fusion” of meanings on the “more general” use she attributes to Pindar. Her attempt to reconcile the opposites is further weakened when she goes to great lengths to find a *tertium quid* between them, a common denominator of the two rival views, which she projects to “underlie” – (implicitly? - unconsciously?) – Pindar's notion of νόμος defining it as an “overarching principle that is greater than gods and men”.

²¹. See Guthrie 1969: 55-134 (esp. 101-7, 131-4 for Callicles' views and his quotation of Pindar).

Callicles claims that his argument is sanctioned by φύσις. He argues that “nature herself makes clear” that “it is right for the superior to have more than the inferior and for the stronger to have absolute sovereignty over the weaker” (483d5). The principle that is endorsed by Callicles can be summed up as “*might is right*”.²²

Callicles' eloquent description of the revolt of the *Übermensch*, is carefully organised with powerful words and imagery, which characterise the violent reactions of the “strong man” against his weaker oppressors.²³

πλάττοντες τοὺς βελτίστους καὶ | ἔρρωμενεστάτους ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, ἐκ νέων
λαμβάνοντες, ὥσπερ | λέοντας, κατεπάδοντές τε καὶ γοητεύοντες κατα-
δουλούμεθα | λέγοντες ὡς τὸ ἴσον χρή ἔχειν καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ καλὸν | καὶ τὸ
δίκαιον. ἐὰν δέ γε οἶμαι φύσιν ἱκανὴν γένηται | ἔχων ἀνὴρ, πάντα ταῦτα
ἀποσεισάμενος καὶ διαρρήξας καὶ | διαφυγών, καταπατήσας τὰ ἡμέτερα
γράμματα καὶ μαγγα|νεύματα καὶ ἐπῳδὰς καὶ νόμους τοὺς παρὰ φύσιν
ἅπαντας, | ἐπαναστὰς ἀνεφάνη δεσπότης ἡμέτερος ὁ δοῦλος, καὶ ἐνταῦθα |
ἐξέλαμψεν τὸ τῆς φύσεως δίκαιον.

Grg. 483e4–484a7 (Dodds)

When a really strong personality arises, he will break out of the social bondage, trample upon all learning tricks, spells, and unnatural conventions (γράμματα καὶ μαγγανεύματα) and reveal the true τὸ τῆς φύσεως δίκαιον by making himself master.²⁴

To support his point of view, Callicles quotes from a well-known poem of Pindar. He claims that Pindar expresses views similar to his own and that he recognises this law:

²². Callicles suggests a rule of conduct based on the analogy of “natural” behaviour. His views are reinforced (but also made cunningly by Plato to appear even bolder and more repulsive), with a bold reference to Darius and Xerxes as justified, on the same basis, for their attack against Greece (483d6). But Plato's reference to νόμος as justifying, taken in this “natural” sense, Darius and Xerxes does bring in mind the contrast to Demaratus' reference to the (conventional) νόμος which rules that the Lacedaemonians should “freely” stay, by obeying the law and not a ruler as the Persian obey Xerxes, and fight a hopeless battle against the aggressor.

²³. The Nietzschean overtones of Callicles' speech are most evident in his immoralistic description of the enslavement of the strong by the weak. Cf. Shorey 1933: 154; Dodds 1990: 269.

²⁴. The former slave becomes society's δεσπότης and thereby the justice of nature shines forth (ἐξέλαμψεν).

δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Πίν|δαρος ἅπερ ἐγὼ λέγω ἐνδείκνυσθαι ἐν τῷ ᾄσματι ἐν ᾧ
λέγει | ὅτι

νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς
θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων·

οὗτος δὲ δῆ, φησὶν,

ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον *
ὑπερτάτῃ χειρί· τεκμαίρομαι
ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος, ἐπεὶ—ἀπριάτας—

λέγει οὕτω πως—τὸ γὰρ ᾄσμα οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι—λέγει δ' ὅτι | οὔτε πριάμενος
οὔτε δόντος τοῦ Γηρυόνου ἠλάσατο τὰς βοῦς, | ὥς τούτου ὄντος τοῦ δικαίου
φύσει, καὶ βοῦς καὶ τᾶλλα κτή|ματα εἶναι πάντα τοῦ βελτιόνος τε καὶ
κρείττονος τὰ τῶν | χειρόνων τε καὶ ἡττόνων.

* βιαιῶν τὸ δικαιοτάτον Mss.

Grg. 484 b1-c (Dodds)

Callicles cites Pindar in order to support his standpoint which seems far from what Pindar implies; the Theban poet tries to *absolve* Heracles' violent attitude by appealing to νόμος in order to justify it, whereas the former clearly claims that the sovereignty of the strongest is *sanctioned* by νόμος.

Plato presents Callicles as quoting Pindar rather flippantly and selectively, only to the extent that it suits his purposes. Callicles was shown to be uninterested in a more critical reading or discussion of the poem, and Plato uses this dismissive attitude of Callicles towards a great poet's most revered hymns to portray Callicles' insolence. At the same time Plato makes Callicles, in his own words, confess an ignorance (and [implied] misunderstanding of the poem), thereby ironically hinting towards a more damning reading of Callicles' confession: τὸ γὰρ ᾄσμα οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι.²⁵

Obviously Callicles understands Pindar's νόμος as a more generic notion referring to the ultimate, “genuine” rule which governs the actions of mortals and immortals, indeed the primordial – natural state of things which directs “ἄγει” everything in its domain, namely, the universe.²⁶

²⁵. This parenthetic sentence according to Treu (1963: 198ff.) would be “*ein Hinweis für Pindarkenner, dass der Sophist den Dichter hier auf seine eigene Weise auslegt, indem er auslässt, was seiner These unbequem werden musste*”. The verb is frequently used in the sense of knowing by rote, as in *Phd.* 61b, οὓς προχείρους εἶχον καὶ ἠπιστάμην μύθους τοὺς Αἰσώπου. It is also used to denote personal acquaintance: as by *Ar. Eq.* 1278. The general picture which we have in Plato's dialogues and in Xenophon, is that both did not rate reading highly as a means of mental training in comparison with oral instruction and conversation. Cf. Kenyon 1932: 24.

²⁶. His argument is the prototype of the “original state of affairs” argument recurrent throughout the history of political philosophy, and more recently seen in Rawls and Nozick.

Already by his time, the fifth and fourth centuries, νόμος had become a more “fluid” notion,²⁷ including the human νόμοι along with the νόμοι which are contrasted to φύσις in the νόμος–φύσις debate. These latter connotations are absent in Pindar who, after all, thinks of human νόμοι as sanctioned by Zeus' will, deriving, and in being accordance with the pre-social, primordial divine law.

Callicles acknowledges this ambiguity in the term νόμος, by often using the modal dative φύσει to clarify the contrast of the genuine, natural law and the original, unadulterated nature of justice as φύσει δίκαιον and τὸ τῆς φύσεως δίκαιον against the *para physin dikaion* of human, unnatural conventions. Callicles' (intended?) pun in extending the use of the word φύσις which he has been using to refer to that which is in nature (τὸ τῆς φύσεως) and the (true) nature φύσις of something is (τούτου ὄντος τοῦ δικαίου φύσει) to also refer to the natural strength (φύσις) of the *Übermensch* is perceived to strengthen his hand in claiming that the demand of the stronger to have more belongs to φύσις, belongs to *his* φύσις and is just *by right* of φύσις and *the true* φύσις of justice: τούτου ὄντος τοῦ δικαίου φύσει.²⁸

Callicles (or Plato's Callicles) is often taken by scholars to be misquoting Pindar by understanding his νόμος as “κατὰ νόμον γε τὸν τῆς φύσεως” (483e3), as the law of nature, and moreover, to portray Pindar as aiming to justify Heracles' violent behaviour by appealing to this (natural) νόμος. I believe that scholars²⁹ are right to see Callicles as misusing Pindar (and see Plato as presenting Callicles to be misusing Pindar) attributing to him a notion of νόμος that calls for a revision of Callicles' contemporaries' conception of νόμος and δίκαιον.³⁰ Callicles' Pindar defends a conception of δίκαιον as πλέον ἔχειν, and not as his contemporary παρὰ φύσιν notion of νόμος implies, *i.e.* as τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν, (484a1: ὡς τὸ ἴσον χρηῖ ἔχειν καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ δίκαιον).

²⁷ Demos 1991: 65.

²⁸ τούτου ὄντος τοῦ δικαίου φύσει: I tend to find here another implied shift in meaning, between what justice is by nature, and what justice is by *its* nature, *i.e.* the nature of justice. Callicles needs to make this inference from the natural state of things to their true nature, in order to derive thereby an imperative of how things should be, and on these grounds he advises how we could be truer to things, respecting (their) nature, and refraining from taking things παρὰ φύσιν.

²⁹ Demos 1991: 65ff.

³⁰ Callicles does not reinterpret Pindar's νόμος exactly as natural law but as implying or dictating what (Callicles') natural law dictates, *i.e.* the right of the stronger.

Callicles manipulates Pindar to offer a notion of νόμος more akin to his νόμος ‘ὁ κατὰ φύσιν’ as defined in the context of the subsequent νόμος–φύσις controversy. He (mis)interprets Pindar's νόμος as implying the Calliclean identification of “δίκαιον” with the right of the stronger *in all cases*. He overlooks Pindar's uneasiness with Heracles' aggression, for which the poet seeks, *in this case*, an excuse, by seeing it in the light of the wider context of Heracles' enforcing Zeus' will as the universal order. Callicles however does not think that Heracles' act needs justification, for he thinks that νόμος itself *is* the right of the stronger “in all cases”. Callicles not only misinterprets Pindar regarding the true sense of the (Pindaric) term νόμος, –which the young sophist understands as tantamount to the φύσει δίκαιον, the natural justice justifying the might of the stronger –, but also intentionally manipulates the meaning of Pindar's poem to suit his particular philosophical stance which he espouses in the *Gorgias*.

Demos thinks that Plato's ironical presentation of Callicles as a person ready to misquote a revered poet to suit his own deviant purposes makes it more plausible to also think that the βιάων τὸ δικαιότατον found in the manuscripts is not necessarily the result of a scribal error (perhaps involving spoonerism, as Dodds ingeniously has suggested). Thus, Plato might be making Callicles cunningly misquote Pindar to make him claim that νόμος directs all to violently claim what is most right of all, that is, the right of the stronger (φύσει δίκαιον). However, as I will attempt to show below, Dodds' view is the least controversial of the many views expounded on the matter.

The primary Mss of Plato (BTWF) have the variant reading βιάων τὸ δικαιότατον, a corruption that is generally thought of as due to copyists rather than to Plato himself. The latter possibility, though less probable, has been held by Wilamowitz³¹ who emended Plato's text to βιάων and he was followed by some scholars.³²

The argument which is most often used against the variant βιάων (βιάων in primary Mss of *Gorgias*), is that the verb βιάόω is unattested and its meaning is unclear.

³¹ Dodds (1990: 27) has sufficiently refuted Wilamowitz' view; The reading variant is not further accepted by Ostwald 1965: 132 n.8; Pavese 1968: 57 n.22 with Crotty 1982: 155 n.1.

³² The reading found in the Mss is accepted as the original Platonic text by: des Places 1949: 171ff.; Irigoin 1952: 16-7 with n.2; Taylor 1960: 117 n.2; Friedländer 1964: vol.II. 260-1.

Wilamowitz justifying the variant, believes that the reading βιαῖων stems from Plato's accidental misquotation of Pindar caused by a lapse of memory, “ein Gedächtnisfehler” and thinks that its meaning would correspond to that of βιαζόμενος.³³

I agree with Dodds, that the corruption in the good manuscripts is no more than a spoonerism.³⁴ For when Plato paraphrases Pindar in *Laws* (714e-715a) ἄγειν δικαιοῦντα τὸ βιαϊότατον, he certainly had in mind what has come to be the modern text; and that this text is Pindar's is also confirmed by the scholion on *Nem.* IX.35a, where the opening lines are quoted down to χειρί.

³³. Wilamowitz 1920a: vol.II.97.

³⁴. Dodds 1990: 272.

Over the next paragraphs (224-6 & 232-3) the orator focuses on the relation of his art with the administration of justice.

223 τίνος οὖν δεῖ τῇ δικαστικῇ πρὸς ταῦτα; πόθεν |
εὐρήσει τὸ δίκαιον ἢ παρὰ τῆς ῥητορικῆς; ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐλέγχει τὰ γιγνόμενα, | ἡ
224 δ' ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐλέγχοις ψηφίζεται. φαίνεται τοίνυν κἀνταῦθα ἡ ῥητορικὴ |
βουλομένη μὲν ταῦτὰ τῇ δικαστικῇ, τοσοῦτον δὲ νικῶσα ὅσον ἀμφοτέρας | 20
συνέχει μόνη βεβαίως. βουλομένη γὰρ ἡ δικαστικὴ, καθάπερ ἐν μάχῃ τῇ |
νομοθετικῇ βοηθῆσαι, ταῦτόν ἔπαθεν αὐτῇ τῇ νομοθετικῇ. ἐκείνη τε γὰρ | 1
ῥητορικῆς πρότερον ἐδέησεν, ὥστε ταύτῃ ἔχειν πάροδον (ἐπὶ) τοὺς | νόμους,
ἡ τε δικαστικὴ σχῆμα ἐπικούρου λαβοῦσα τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῇ | πρότερον
προσεδεήθη τῆς παρὰ τῆς ῥητορικῆς βοηθείας. ἔδει γὰρ αὐτὴν | 5
225 βοηθῆσαι· τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἦν ἄνευ ῥητορικῆς. τοσοῦτω δὴ | σεμνότερον καὶ
τιμιώτερον [ἡ] ῥητορικὴ δικαστικῆς ὅσω μικροῦ δέω | λέγειν δικαστῆς δημίου.
ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐλέγχει τὰδικήματα ὁ ῥήτωρ καὶ | παραδίδωσι τῷ δικαστῇ, ὁ δ'

³⁵. On Aristides' method and the Platonic contradictions cf. **Schmid-Staehlin-Christ** 1924: 704ff.

- ἀκούσας καὶ μαθὼν παραδίδωσιν αὖ τοῖς | ὑπηρέταις, καὶ μέσος ἔσθ' ὁ
 226 δικαστῆς διακόνου καὶ ῥήτορος. αὐθις δὲ | ἐπειδὴν τέλος ἡ δίκη λάβῃ, τῇ μὲν 10
 δικαστικῇ πλέον οὐδ' ὅτιοῦν περίεστιν, | ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἡ νομοθετικὴ θεῖσα τοὺς
 νόμους ἀπήλλακται, οὕτως ὁ | δικαστῆς μετὰ τὴν κρίσιν. εἰσδεξαμένη δὲ ἡ
 ῥητορικὴ τοὺς ἥτοι δι' | ἄγνοϊαν ἢ δι' ἀγνωμοσύνην ἀγανακτοῦντας τοῖς
 δεδικασμένοις καὶ πρὸς | θορύβους ἢ στάσεις τὰ πράγματα ἐξάγοντας
 κατέχει καὶ νουθετεῖ, | πείθουσα στέργειν τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τῇ ψήφῳ τῶν 15
 δικαστῶν, οὐ τὸν | Πινδάρου νόμον τιμῶσα, ὥ τάναντία αὐτὰ λέγων τῇ
 φύσει τῆς ῥητορικῆς, | οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἐπάδουσα «Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς
 θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων | ἄγει δικαίων τὸ βιαιότατον ὑπερτάτα
 χειρί. τεκμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν Ἑρακλέος, ἐπεὶ ἀπριάτας...» οὐ γὰρ φῆς
 227 ὅλου μεμνησθαι, ἐχρῆν δὲ ἴσως | οὐδὲ τούτων, μὴ οὖν ἐπὶ ῥητορικὴν γε. ἀλλ' 1
 ἄχρι μὲν τούτου καὶ ἡ | ῥητορικὴ λέγει, νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θνατῶν τε
 καὶ ἀθανάτων· τὰ δὲ | ἐξῆς οὐκέτι ταῦτά— πόθεν; οὐδέποτε ἡμέρα καὶ νύξ
 ταῦτά συμφήσουσιν | — ἀλλὰ πᾶν τούναντίον ἄγει τὰ δίκαια πρεσβεύων
 καὶ τοὺς ἐν ὕβρει | θρασεῖς νουθετῶν. εἰ γὰρ ἀξιῶσει τὸ βιαιότατον νόμον 5
 εἶναι τὸν δικαιοῦντα | καὶ τὴν ὑπερτάτην χεῖρα κρατεῖν Ἑρακλέους, ὥ μετὰ
 228 τῆς χειρὸς τῶν | δικαίων ἐμέλησεν, αὐτῇ τοῖς ἑαυτῆς λόγοις ἀπολεῖται. τίς
 γὰρ τόπος | λοιπὸν ἢ χρεῖα ῥητορικῆς ἢ λόγων, εἰ τὸ δίκαιον ἢ χεῖρ ὀριεῖ καὶ
 μηδὲν | πλέον ἔσται τῷ δυναμένῳ διδάξαι περὶ τοῦ πράγματος; ποῦ δὲ τὸ
 πείθειν, | εἰ τὸ βιάζεσθαι κρατήσῃ; καὶ ταῦτα αὐτῆς, ἥς ἔργον πείθειν, δούσης | 10
 229 βιάζεσθαι; δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Πίνδαρος, εἴ τι δεῖ περὶ τοῦ ἄσματος | εἰπεῖν, οὐκ
 εἰσηγούμενος οὐδὲ συμβουλευὼν σπουδῇ ταῦτα λέγειν τοῖς | ἀνθρώποις,
 ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἰ σχετλιάζων. τεκμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν Ἑρακλέος | αὐτοῖς τούτοις,
 ὅτι καὶ ἐτέρωθι μεμνημένος περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν διθυράμβῳ | τινί, «Σὲ δ' ἐγὼ 15
 παρ' ἀμῖν» φησὶν «αἰνέω μὲν Γηρυόνη, τὸ δὲ μὴ Διὶ | φίλτερον σιγῶμι
 πάμπαν.» οὐ γὰρ εἰκός, φησὶν, ἀρπαζομένων τῶν ὄντων | καθῆσθαι παρ'
 230 ἐστία καὶ κακὸν εἶναι. καίτοι τό γε πρὸς νόμον καὶ | ταῦτα ἀνθρώπων ἅμα
 καὶ θεῶν βασιλέα μάχεσθαι οὐκ ἦν ἐπαινεῖν πρὸς | Πινδάρου, οὐδὲ
 συμβουλεύειν πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. αὐτὸς γοῦν τὸ | τοιοῦτον κέκληκεν 20
 231 «Ὀλισθηρὸν οἶμον» καὶ κελεύει φυλάττεσθαι. ἀλλὰ | τί, φησί, τούτων ἐμοὶ 1
 νῦν; εἴτε γὰρ δοκοῦντα Πινδάρῳ ταῦτ' ἦν εἴτε | μή, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γε ῥητορικῇ
 δείξει τὸ τοιοῦτον δοκοῦν. οὐ δεῖ γὰρ ἀρπάζειν | ἕκαστον κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ
 τοῦτο νόμον καλεῖν, ἀλλ' ἕκαστον τῶν δικαίων | τυγχάνειν, καὶ τὸν ταῦτα
 διαιροῦντα νόμον τιμᾶν, καὶ καλεῖν γε μόνον τὸ | τοιοῦτον νόμον καὶ 5
 232 τούναντίον παρανομίαν. τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ δόγμα τῆς | ῥητορικῆς καὶ τούτῳ
 σύνεστι τῷ νόμῳ καὶ περὶ τούτου πείθει τηροῦσα | ὅπως μηδεὶς ὑπερβήσεται,
 τοὺς ὑπερβαίνοντας σωφρονίζουσα. μέγιστον | δὲ μαρτύριον· οὐ μὲν γὰρ

νόμος καὶ δίκαι, ἐνταῦθα καὶ ῥητορικὴ καὶ λόγοι, | οὐ δ' ὑπερτέρα χεὶρ
ἀφαιρεῖται τὸ δίκαιον, οὐδὲν ἴδοις ἂν ἐκεῖ ῥητορικῇ | διοικούμενον. 10

(*Aristid. 2, 223-32 (1,207-10 L-B.)*)

Aristides' context

Aristides tries to illustrate the importance and the superiority of the art of oratory over that of the administration of justice on the following grounds:³⁶

1. The art of the administration of justice and legislation itself are subject to the same deficiency: both need aid from oratory in achieving their aims. Legislation in particular is in need of oratory, so that by this it gains access to the laws (§217), whereas now the art of the administration of justice being the succourer of the laws, needs power from oratory to help (§224). Aristides illustrates the importance and value of oratory over the art of the administration of justice by drawing an analogy between a juror and a public executioner. The roles of orator and juror are clearly circumscribed: The orator examines crimes and passes the matter over to the juror, who having listened and learned, in turn passes the matter over to the public servant (διάκονος).

2. When a trial is concluded, nothing more is left to the art of administration of justice. The function of legislator and that of juror terminates as soon as the former has established laws and the latter has returned a verdict. However, oratory's function does not stop here. It takes on those who either through ignorance or cruelty are angry at the verdict (δι' ἀγνοίαν ἢ δι' ἀγνωμοσύνην ἀγανακτοῦντας τοῖς δεδικασμένοις).

Oratory's duty is to restrain and admonish them persuading them στέργειν τοῖς νόμοις καὶ τῇ ψήφῳ τῶν δικαστῶν (to be acquiesce with the laws and the vote of the jurors).

This is followed by Aristides' emphatic assertion that the art of oratory does not honour the Pindaric law which is in opposition to the nature of oratory. The orator's art neither honours nor 'sings this refrain':

226 «Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων | ἄγει δικαίων τὸ 17
βιαιότατον ὑπερτάτα χεῖρί. τεκμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν Ἑρακλέος, ἐπεὶ ἀπριά-
τας...» οὐ γὰρ φῆς ὅλου μεμνησθαι, ἐχρῆν δὲ ἴσως | οὐδὲ τούτων, μὴ οὖν ἐπὶ
ῥητορικὴν γε.

(*Aristid. 2, 226 (1,208-9 L-B.)*)

³⁶. Cf. the interpretation of the scholia *ad loc.*

These words, though highly rhetorical, have a serious undertone. Although Plato's name is suppressed, Aristides evidently has in mind the quote which in *Gorgias* comes in the context of Callicles' reference to the νόμος–φύσις antithesis,³⁷ whereas in Aristides' text Pindar's gnome is cited in the context of his defence of ῥητορική as an art which “teaches and advises – νοουθετεῖ” what is just and good.

The continuity of Aristides' *narratio* is interrupted in §226 where four lines from Pindar are quoted verbatim, whereas the rest are quoted abridged in paraphrase.

Although Aristides obviously follows the Platonic text,³⁸ this technique serves as a formula of even transition which allows him to bring Pindar's statement to a rapid conclusion and also contributes to its better adaptation into his argument. This device is obviously a necessary part of Aristides' technique in preserving more Pindaric text (verbatim and paraphrase simultaneously) without engaging himself in a long digression.

οὐ γὰρ φῆς ὅλου μεμνησθαι:

Aristides' reference to Plato's wording “You say you do not remember all of it” is being used as springboard to “You should not have remembered any of such an unacceptable pronouncement”. Aristides also succeeds in making his reference to Plato more personalised even without mentioning his name. The reader can realise that behind that statement is hidden a specific attack on Plato's (Callicles') interpretation, which is considered as an inadmissible argument against his art.

Aristides employs the Pindaric quote in order not only, or not so much, to identify with the initial statement of it, with the wording of which oratory agrees, “νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων” while cutting off the rest of it τὰ δὲ ἐξῆς οὐκέτι ταῦτά, but to use it as a platform to stress oratory's contrast with the Calliclean sophistic position of natural law. He will achieve this by showing Pindar's notion of ‘νόμος’ and justice (as interpreted by Callicles) to be the antipode of oratory's views on law and justice. This polarity helps the orator to assert oratory's position on the matter. At

³⁷. The opposition between the “justice of nature” and society's conception of justice is emphasised by Callicles throughout his argument.

³⁸. Callicles quotes 2-4 lines verbatim and paraphrases the next couplet.

a later stage, he will also show this reading of Pindar by Callicles to be inept and ill-intended. Pindar after all is closer to oratory than to Callicles.

In a sequence of successive rhetorical questions, Aristides considers as contradictory the coexistence of *violence* and *oratory* (ποῦ δὲ τὸ πείθειν, εἰ τὸ βιάζεσθαι κρατήσῃ; §228). Oratory cannot grant the use of force. What could be the place and utility of oratory if justice were defined by force?

For Aristides Plato's (Callicles') interpretation of Pindar is a product of misunderstanding. The orator proceeds (§229) to give his personal opinion περὶ τοῦ ἔσματος as to why Pindar refers to the deeds of Heracles: Pindar neither proposed nor advised them seriously to mankind, but, as it were indignantly:

οὐκ εἰσηγούμενος οὐδὲ συμβουλεύων σπουδῇ ταῦτα λέγειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἰ σχετλιάζων.³⁹

In what follows, Aristides earnestly embarks on the task of showing Callicles' inept reading of Pindar and goes at great length to show Pindar unlike Callicles to be aware of a moral question raised by Hercules' aggression (cf. *fr.* 169a.16-7). Pindar is shown to sense the moral ambivalence surrounding Heracles' acts and is keen to find a path which both preserves his own notions of 'law-abidingness' while not questioning the Νόμος' universal rule.

δικαιῶν τὸ βιαίωτον:

All the best manuscripts of the *Gorgias* (484b), the *Bodleianus*, the *Venetus*, and the two *Vindobonenses* W and F read βιάων τὸ δικαιοτάτον in l.3; only a marginal note in the *Parisinus* 2110 (V) a Byzantine manuscript, has the reading δικαιῶν τὸ βιαίωτον accepted by Maehler, Snell, Bowra, and most modern editors.⁴⁰

³⁹. Aristides' explanation is according to Pindar's beliefs on justice and law. He considers Pindar's justification as a product of the poet's indignation against the monstrous nature of Geryon and Diomedes which places them beyond the pale, even though their reaction to Heracles is laudable. Geryon was regarded as one of Heracles' most formidable opponents (*Th.* 981) and a serious challenge to the prowess and endurance of the hero.

⁴⁰. This is the reading found in *Or.* II.226 and the corresponding scholion, and in the scholion on *Nem.* IX.35a. Turyn's alteration ἄγει δίκαιον is assumed unnecessary. His argument that denominative verbs in —όω are rare in Pindar and Bacchylides, is true; cf. Pavese 1968: 57 with n.23; Dodds 1990: 270 (ἄγει); Irigoin 1952: 17 n.2 adopts Wilamowitz's βιάων in the place of βιάων (1920a: vol.II.95-100), but he considers Croiset's ἄγειν δικαιοῖ τὸ βιαίωτον unsupported from the indirect tradition.

In spite of the majority opinion which argues against the possibility of Plato's purposely having Callicles misquote Pindar, I think that both sides of the issue should be studied, especially in light of the quotation's context within Aristides' oration. From the analysis of the context it is clear that the orator offers the genuine Pindaric reading which, as we have argued, he obtains from a manuscript of the dialogue which contained the right *lectio*. This possibility is further supported by Aristides' paraphrase of Pindar's δικαιῶν τὸ βιαίότατον when he puts forward the hypothesis that:

(227) εἰ γὰρ ἀξιῶσει τὸ βιαίότατον νόμον εἶναι τὸν δικαιοῦντα | καὶ τὴν ὑπερτάτην χεῖρα κρατεῖν Ἡρακλέους, ᾧ μετὰ τῆς χειρὸς τῶν | δικαίων ἐμέλησεν, αὐτὴ [sc. ἡ ῥητορική] τοῖς ἐαυτῆς λόγοις ἀπολεῖται: “If oratory will assert that there is a law which justifies the utmost violence and that the most mighty hand of Heracles ought to prevail, who with his hand cared for justice...”

Therefore Aristides quotes and paraphrases the right reading.⁴¹ One would expect Aristides to have noticed any discrepancy in Plato's quotation and to amend Pindar's text, as Libanius did when confronted with the variant reading in his copy of *Gorgias* and juxtaposing it with the right one he found in Aristides, accused in his *Ἀπολογία Σωκράτους* Polycrates for having Anytus purposely misquote Pindar.⁴²

Aristides in his paraphrase (§227) of Pindar's *ll.*3-5 intentionally introduces two changes:

⁴¹ Dodds (1990: 272), dates the corruption after Aristides and before Libanius. However, we should not deem Aristides' tradition as *terminus post quem* for the appearance of the corruption in Mss, but we should antedate it at least to the time close to Aristides on palaeographical grounds: The false reading βιαίων τὸ δικαιοτάτον was common in both families of the medieval Mss BTWF. From these the F tradition is demonstrably of different origin, holding a unique position among the manuscripts of Plato, because according to Dodds it is related to the tradition represented by the papyrus fragments of the *Gorgias*. Unfortunately none of the surviving papyri preserves the section 484b, where the false reading occurs. However, in other surviving passages, the text transmitted by the papyri (Π², Π³, and apparently also Π⁴), being detached from the mediaeval archetype of *Gorgias*, agrees in manifest errors with F against BTW (e.g. Π³ at 486d6 ὅτι; and again Π² and apparently also Π⁴ at 522d8; cf. Dodds 1990: 42). Thus, the F tradition goes back at least as far as the 2nd cent. AD, to which all these papyri of the Antonine and post-Antonine periods belong, but to infer from this that the wrong reading must already have existed in the 2nd century could be an *argumentum ex silentio*. Aristides whose tradition agrees with F —[he seems to have agreed with F also at 463c4 and 519c1]—, was probably aware of this textual problem: he may have found both readings in contemporary Mss. Burnet (1902: 98ff., *id.* 1903: 12ff.), who first established the importance of the F tradition, concluded that “F was independently derived from... an ancient tradition of the text distinct from that preserved in our older medieval Mss”. (: quoted by Dodds 1990: 41).

⁴² See Pack 1947: 17-20 for Aristides' influence on Libanius. For a detailed discussion of the scholarly literature on this topic, see Markowski 1910: 20-66. Cf. Foerster's introduction to vol. V of his 1909 edition of Libanius' works (1-4) and Dodds' comments in 1990: 28-9, 271-2.

1. He makes the present participle δικαίων adjectival τὸν δικαιοῦντα.

2. The dative phrase ὑπερτάτῃ χειρὶ also presents problems since Aristides in his paraphrase assumes that the “highest hand” belongs to Heracles and not to Νόμος, as it is clearly implied in Pindar’s text.⁴³ Aristides’ divergence on this point made Demos in her treatment⁴⁴ of *fr.*169a consider the paraphrase as misleading and to explain this Demos has to assume that: “*unless [Aristides] infers that the 'hand' of νόμος is Herakles' by implication, since the hero's violent deeds are sanctioned by νόμος*”.⁴⁵ Demos, failing to detect the rhetorical tactic of Aristides, accused him of confusing the reference to Heracles in the poem cited by Plato with another from Pindar (: *fr.*81).

I do not think Aristides confused the reference to Heracles in the *fr.*169a with another taken from a dithyramb of Pindar. The reference to Heracles in *fr.*81 seems quite natural to me considering Aristides’ rhetorical tactic: Callicles pleaded *fr.*169a as evidence for his views on the right of the strong man, and consequently Pindar’s view forms the base of his argumentation. Aristides’ intention is to rebut this argument showing that it is based on fallacy. In spite of the fragmentary state of the two Pindar poems, one can conclude with some certainty that Pindar treats the theme of the *labours* of Heracles in an ambivalent way,⁴⁶ and consequently Plato should not have Callicles quote *fr.*169a as proof of his views. With this purpose in mind, Aristides focusing on Heracles’ persona quotes –as we shall see– *fr.*81 as a *counterbalance* to the hero’s sanctioned actions in *fr.*169a.

Aristides immediately after discussing the passage cited by Callicles, quotes a sequence of four extracts from Pindar’s poetry. Aristides in his first two quotations aims to demonstrate that not even Pindar himself endorsed Heracles’ violence as Callicles wrongly inferred.

⁴³. Pindar did not expressed the idea of the absoluteness of god, as some modern critics take it. See Gigante 1956: 96; cf. Pavese’s right interpretation (1968: 60): “Νόμος, as a *paredros* of Zeus, sits at the side or his throne and administers his justice with a powerful hand”. The scholion on Aristides has by way of interpretation τὸ δίκαιον ἐν ἰσχυροτάτῃ χειρὶ ἀνύει. I wonder whether the scholiast read ἀνεί for ἄγει in Pindar’s text?

⁴⁴. Demos 1991: 59.

⁴⁵. I doubt whether Aristides regarded Heracles’ violent deeds as sanctioned by νόμος, since according to the nature of oratory they were illegal. Cf. §227 with §232.

⁴⁶. Although Pindar thinks that is right for Heracles’ opponents to try to resist his violent actions, praising explicitly Geryon (*fr.*81), he also simultaneously considers the violence of Heracles as something which can be justified.

III.1.3 Aristid. 2, 229 (1,209 L.-B.) = Pind. fr. 81.

While explaining why Pindar justified Heracles' deeds, Aristides quotes some lines from a Pindaric dithyramb:

229 τεκμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος | αὐτοῖς τούτοις, ὅτι καὶ ἐτέρωθι μεμνημένος
περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν διθυράμβῳ | τινί, «Σὲ δ' ἐγὼ παρ' ἀμῖν» φησὶν «αἰνέω μὲν 15
Γηρυόνη, τὸ δὲ μὴ Διὶ | φίλτερον σιγῶμι πάμπαν.»

(Aristid. 2, 229 (1,209 L.-B.))

15 παρ' ἀμῖν edd. a(?): παρ' ἀμῖν TQR^{rec}: παράμιν EU: παρ' αμιν A: παρ αμιν V: παρά μιν
Hermann γηρυόνι AEa; Γαρυόνα Schroeder Δι Hermann 16 σιγῶμι TQV: σιγῶ μὴ AEUR^{rec}a

Pindar Fr. 81

Pindar says in the lines cited by Aristides that he praises (αἰνέω) Geryon in comparison to Heracles but he immediately cuts short his treatment of the subject – not unusual for Pindar–, interjecting the phrase “*May I be altogether silent regarding that which is not pleasing (φίλτερον) to Zeus*”. Pindar thinks that his praise of Geryon might be considered offensive by Zeus.⁴⁷

Though Pindar says that religious convictions prevent him from expressing his feelings towards Geryon, this is a rhetorical excuse (*praeteritio*) as much as one based on deep religious feeling. This statement is often interpreted as an illustration of Pindar's devout (εὐσεβής) piety, and up to a point this is true, but it must also be recognised as a rhetorical device which can be used either to deny the truth of a myth Pindar finds offensive, as in *Ol.* I.35, 52ff. about Pelops, or more often either to break off or refuse to relate a myth which, although offensive, is not in fact denied.⁴⁸

The rhetorical nature of this Pindaric device can be particularly useful for Aristides' *argumentatio*, since mentioning and then abandoning what has just been said about Geryon serves to arouse the reader's interest and to highlight by contrast a different portrait of Geryon which Aristides propounds.

Aristides' quotation is our sole authority for this dithyrambic excerpt, and from this point of view is instructive to the extent that here Pindar implies that Geryon is

⁴⁷. Crotty (1982: 105), argues: “*It is his duty to praise the praiseworthy, blame the blameworthy, and failure to do this is very wrong*”.

⁴⁸. Cf. *Ol.* IX.35-41, XIII.91, *Nem.* V.13-9, 81.

praiseworthy because he tries to resist Heracles' taking of the cattle by force.⁴⁹ According to Aristides, Plato misunderstood Pindar because the poet's treatment of Heracles is ambivalent. Although Pindar considers the hero's violence justified, he also simultaneously thinks that Geryon is a praiseworthy opponent.

Consequently, according to the orator the deeds of Heracles cannot be adduced as an apt paradigm of justified violence, as Plato did.

We do not possess enough evidence to be in a position to appreciate the nature and reliability of Aristides' quotation. The scholion on Aristides explains that Pindar praises Geryon for defending his property when Heracles unjustly takes it away by force (3,409 Dind. A Oxon.). We have no further evidence, however, to infer that the scholiast had any more at hand beside Aristides' excerpt. However, he could have had in mind the analogy of Heracles' attack against Diomedes (the king who fed his horses with human flesh) which receives a more detailed account by Pindar, and Pindar's explanation that Diomedes defended himself against Heracles “οὐ κό]ρω ἀλλ' ἀρετᾷ”.⁵⁰ We should also bear in mind that Aristides' scholiast does supply us with the completion of the statement after ‘ἐπεὶ’ (3,408 Dind. AB Oxon.):

ἐπεὶ Γηρυόνου βόας Κυκλωπείων ἐπὶ προθύρων Εὐρυσθέως συναιρεῖται καὶ ἀπριάτας ἔλασεν.

thus supporting the view that he had a (more) complete copy of Pindar at hands.

⁴⁹. Lobel (1961: 149 n.1), raises a textual issue concerning fr. 81 in Aristides' text: “*It seems to me highly probable that the clause ὅτι...πάμπαν, is a learned parallel which has intruded into the text of Aristides*”. The γάρ refers to the preceding sentence and it makes sense to argue that the content of the sentence that follows γάρ –although Pindar included it in the Diomedes episode–, is also true for Geryon who resisted Heracles' taking his cattle by force. To steal the cattle of Geryon was more outrageous than to steal the horses of Diomedes which were unpleasant animals. The cows of Geryones were harmless. Aristides appears rather careless in the way he paraphrases or interprets the passage and this may account for Lobel's suggestion. On the other hand the passage exists in all codices (ATEVR^{rec}QU) and it is rather difficult to see how it could have been interpolated (ὅτι is often used by Aristides introducing verbatim quotations, cf. fr.76).

Contextual considerations also suggest that it forms part of Aristides' text: his rhetoric here is to show that Pindar treated Heracles in an ambivalent way. Therefore, it makes good sense to treat fr. 81 as an instance where Pindar deprecated Heracles' action aiming to counterbalance the hero's action in fr. 169a. Indeed Aristides, refuting Plato's interpretation of Pindar, holds that what the poet said about Heracles was not an endorsement / justification of Heracles' action but he had spoken indignantly (σχετλιάζων). Aristides explicitly substantiates his judgement on the very deeds of Heracles (τεκμαίρομαι). Therefore, it is absolutely necessary for him to quote another instance from Pindar to counterbalance Heracles' image in the opening of fr. 169a, and in this sense fr. 81 may well stand in Aristides' text. For Heracles in the tradition of Pindar and Bacchylides see Galinsky 1972: 23-40.

⁵⁰. Cf. the marginal scholion on the papyrus Fr. I. col.ii. 10.

It is natural for Aristides to keep the Pindaric expression τεκμαίρομαι ἔργοισιν Ἡρακλέος in introducing *fr.* 81 after Pindar's fashion, as often ἔργα implies “mighty deeds” those of god or a hero (cf. *Nem.* VI.8).

Aristides does not show that he desired great accuracy – as in *fr.* 169a – introducing the following alterations:

1. Aristides' Mss read παρ' ἀμίν “among ourselves”. The editors⁵¹ have preferred the (Epic) μίν to the (Doric) νίν. The schol. Aristid. 3,409 Dind. σὲ δὲ, ὥ Γηρυόνη, ἐπαινῶ παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν Ἡρακλέα... makes it clear that the Pindaric text should be παρὰ μιν instead of παρ' ἀμίν. Both forms are not infrequent in *codd.* Pind. (cf. *Pae.* II.73; VI.115); whereas the pronoun μίν is unattested in Attic prose.

2. Aristides preserved the attic form Γηρυόνη instead of Γηρυόνα (:editors) and Δί instead of Δί (:editors).

The Doric elements are eliminated in Aristides' quotation and this could be explained as mainly aiming to spare the reader who is unfamiliar with dialectal peculiarities from unnecessary distractions like unfamiliar language.

⁵¹. Hermann first printed παρὰ μιν by collation of scholion παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν Ἡρακλέα; cf. also LSJ s.v. μιν.

III.1.3 Aristid. 2, 229 (1,209 L.-B.) = Pind. fr. 169.16-7.

Immediately after his quotation (fr.81), Aristides attempts to explain why Pindar preferred to praise Geryon's behaviour rather than that of Heracles. For this purpose, he quotes:

229 οὐ γὰρ εἰκός, φησὶν, ἀρπαζομένων τῶν ὄντων | καθῆσθαι παρ' ἐστίᾳ καὶ 16
κακὸν εἶναι.

(Aristid. 2, 229 (1,209 L.-B.))

The publication of P.Oxy. 2450 by Lobel proves that Aristides indeed had read the whole poem of Pindar from which he has preserved only ll.16-7 in paraphrase.⁵²

Behr prints the above lines as part of Aristides' oration without mentioning Pindar's authorship of the lines in the *apparatus*. A careful collation of Aristides' testimony with P.Oxy. 2450.16-7 shows that the words are Pindar's.⁵³ Aristides' quotation succeeds in rendering the tone, the language and the style of the corresponding lines in the papyrus.

The natural interpretation of these lines in the light of Aristides' context is: Geryon is resisting Heracles because it is better to die defending one's property against a robber than to be a coward.⁵⁴ He finds it unreasonable for Geryon to sit by his hearth cowardly when his possessions are being stolen; (cf. scholion *ad loc.*). This view is confirmed by the verses 16&17 of P.Oxy. 2450:

A' col. 2

3 υ- γ]ὰρ ἀρπαζομένων τεθνάμεν
17 X-]μάτων ἢ κακὸν ἔμμεναι.
(fr.169a.16-7).

There can be no doubt that the *Diomedes episode* is the theme of the col. 2 in papyrus from l.9 and onwards. But Aristides quoting ll.16&17, refers them only to Geryon.

⁵². P.Oxy. 2450 is dated within the first or early in the second cent. AD (Lobel 1961: 142), and so is contemporary with Aristides' speech.

⁵³. Karadimas errs in assuming these lines to be Aristides' himself (1996: 82, n.85).

⁵⁴. This interpretation is also supported by the marginal scholion on P.Oxy. 2450 fr.1 Col.ii (b): οὐκ ἐπὶ ὕβρει, ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα. τὸ γὰρ [τὰ ἑαυτοῦ μὴ προ]ίεσθαι ἀνδρείου (ἐστίν) [] ἀλλ' οὐχ ὕβριστ[οῦ]. 'Ηρα]κλῆς δ(ἐ) ἠδ[ί]κει [ἀφελό]μενος. This was restored and supplemented by Lobel from Aristides and its corresponding scholion.

A partial reconstruction of *ll.* 15-7 indicates that the Thracian King is praised by Pindar for having put up a struggle in defence of his property.⁵⁵ Consequently, one can infer that Geryon is also praised tacitly by Pindar at *ll.* 4-8 for defending his possessions as he did also in *fr.* 81. The logical combination of both accounts led Aristides to associate Geryon with Diomedes and to quote *fr.* 169a.16-7 immediately after *fr.* 81 as an exegesis of why Pindar considered Geryon's attitude praiseworthy, giving in that way the impression that Pindar was justifying Geryon's actions too.

Aristides appears to be very eclectic in his use of the *Diomedes episode*. Suppressing mention of Diomedes' name, he switches over to paraphrase, making in this respect Pindar's verses conform to his context.⁵⁶ Avoiding irrelevant mythological details, Aristides makes Pindar's words look cogent, so that no one could dispute the inalienable right of the defender to protect his possessions, the transgression of which constitutes an offence against the Law. Pindar is presented as agreeing with the nature and the aim of the art of oratory as Aristides has described them before (§210ff.).

From the poem's extant contents, it can be argued that Pindar seems to have focused upon the violence of these "labours of Heracles".⁵⁷ Aristides, having a good knowledge of the poem, evidently noticed Pindar's intention and assumed that the βία, which was the *modus operandi* of Heracles, was sharply against the main principles of oratory. From this point of view, Aristides presents Pindar as agreeing with his own sense of law-abidingness.⁵⁸ In these two instances quoted by Aristides, Heracles undoubtedly delivered an unprovoked attack and acted unjustly.

⁵⁵. Lloyd-Jones (1972: 49) unlike Pavese (1968: 67ff.), thinks that Diomedes resisted Heracles' violence rather than vice versa. He rejects Pavese's interpretation, based on the fragmentary lines provided by the papyrus, that Heracles is bringing Diomedes' violent deeds to justice. Diomedes' motivation for resisting Heracles (*l.* 15 out of ἀρετῇ) seems to support Lloyd-Jones' argument which implies that Pindar does not blame Diomedes for protecting his property. Pavese's view also contradicts what is said in the marginal scholion.

⁵⁶. Plato also understandably passed his name over in silence and the scholia on Arist. do not make any mention of Diomedes' name.

⁵⁷. Note the phrase βίᾱς ὁδόν (P.Oxy. 2450, *l.* 19) as a possible reference to Heracles' labours.

⁵⁸. The Law spoken of is that which the Greeks understood by χειρῶν νόμος (Aeschin. *c. Tim.* 5), the Germans by 'Faust-recht', and the English by 'Club-law', or the 'law of the stronger'. This sense alone agrees with the context in Plato, who at *Lg.* 690c contrasts, with a reference to this passage, τὴν τοῦ νόμου ἐκόντων ἀρχήν with βίαιον.

The quote in its extant form will not be far from the sense and even the language of the text as preserved at P.Oxy. 2450. A collation of Aristides' paraphrase with the corresponding lines in the papyrus, shows that Aristides introduced only the following minor alterations:

1. If we read κτη]μάτων at l. 17 (suggested by Pavese, rather than χρη]μάτων: Lobel), Aristides changed it to the participle ὄντων (a more comprehensive term), preceded by its article τῶν.

2. κακὸν ἔμμεναι (Pindar) : κακὸν εἶναι (Aristides).

3. γὰρ is preserved in the paraphrase. (Lobel suppl. κρέσσον γ]ὰρ from Aristid. text. Lobel's supplement is superior to others).

4. τεθνάμεν (l.16): is omitted in the paraphrase.

5. The use of φησὶν indicates the introduction of quotation. Aristides used the same verb before in citing *fr.* 81.

III.1.3 Aristid. 2, 230 (1,209 L.-B.) = Pind. *Pyth.* II.94-5, 96.

Aristides' context

In the second couple of Aristides' quotations (§230), Pindar is again presented as agreeing with Aristides' sense of law-abidingness. The poet did not recommend breaking the law. Calling the law ἀνθρώπων ἅμα καὶ θεῶν βασιλέα, Aristides paraphrases for a third time *fr.* 169a.1-2. This shows that these opening lines had become proverbial in antiquity as a standard description of νόμος,⁵⁹ which is quoted also by Arist. *rhet.* 3, 3 p.1406a 22, as an example of the cold style he traced in the rhetor Alcidas.

Aristides, quoting *Pyth.* II.94-5, 96 in a metaphorical sense, presents Pindar as not advising transgression of the law –as Plato assumed–, rather, he considers such a practice unreasonable:

230 καίτοι τό γε πρὸς νόμον καὶ | ταῦτα ἀνθρώπων ἅμα καὶ θεῶν βασιλέα 17
μάχεσθαι οὐκ ἦν ἐπαινεῖν πρὸς | Πινδάρου, οὐδὲ συμβουλεύειν πρὸς κέντρα
λακτίζειν. αὐτὸς γοῦν τὸ | τοιοῦτον κέκληκεν «Ὀλισθηρὸν οἶμον» καὶ κελεύει
φυλάττεσθαι.

(Aristid. 2, 230 (1,209 L.-B.))

Aristides asserts that it was not Pindar's part to praise fighting against the law, nor to counsel “*Kicking against the pricks*”. Such a thing Pindar himself called “*a slippery path*” and bade us pay heed against doing.

Pindar *Pyth.* II.94-6

The central myth that Pindar treated in *Pyth.* II is that of Ixion, through which he introduces the theme of deceit and its consequences. The myth is closed by a long maxim on the omnipotence of god (*l.* 49ff.). Pindar, reverting to previous thoughts on the unpredictability of god, who elevates one man and then another, observes that:

PYTHIA II (475?)

ἰαίνει φθονερῶν· στάθμας δέ τινες ἐλκόμενοι 90
ἵπερ ἰσσοῦς ἐνέπαξαν ἑλ-
κος ὀδυναρὸν ἑᾶ πρόσθε καρδίᾳ,
πρὶν ὅσα φροντίδι μητίονται τυχεῖν.
ἔφέρειν δ' ἐλαφρῶς ἐπαυχένιον λαβόντα ζυγόν
ἀρήγει· ποτὶ κέντρον δέ τοι

⁵⁹. Cf. the Homeric formula for Zeus: ὁ πάντων βασιλεὺς θνατῶν τε καὶ ἀθανάτων, cf. *Th.* 923, Heracl. *fr.* B53 πόλεμος πάντων μὲν πατήρ ἐστι, πάντων δὲ βασιλεὺς.

λακτιζέμεν τελέθει
 ὀλισθηρὸς οἶμος· ἄδόν-
 τα δ' εἶη με τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὀμιλεῖν.

95

(Pyth. II.89-96).

Pindar stresses that the φθονεροί destroy themselves by fighting against the natural order of the things and the limitations imposed on them by the gods. They strive to upset the equilibrium⁶⁰ and this causes their downfall.⁶¹ In this gnomic section – as Carey suggests– “Pindar advocates *willing* acquiescence in the laws of the universe”. He obviously advises that everybody has to bear the “yoke” lightly and not to “*Kick at the goad*”.⁶²

Pindar, rapidly changing metaphors, develops a new image, which in antiquity became a paroimia: ποτὶ κέντρον δέ τοι λακτιζέμεν.⁶³ Such a resistance is an absurdity and is further considered as vain and perilous⁶⁴ by Pindar who compares it to ὀλισθηρὸς οἶμος.⁶⁵

The sentence πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν was proverbial as early as the time of Aeschylus⁶⁶, and familiar to us from Acts [9,5] 26,14. However, we do not know if it was a proverb before Pindar.

Aristides quotes Pyth. II.94-5 and 96 to provide a learned parallel in his argument. These two quotes serve as corroborative evidence for his claim that even

⁶⁰. See Carey 1981: 61; cf. Thummer 1972: 306.

⁶¹. This is illustrated by the image of στάθμα (II.89-91). For the meaning of the image cf. Most 1987: 571-84. Burton (1962: 132) suggests that the scene envisaged is as at II.12.421ff., where “two men disputing over a piece of land with a measuring line stretched between them”.

⁶². Carey 1981 *ad loc.* For the image of ζυγός see Braswell 1988: l. 234. Cf. also schol. Pyth. IV.171a; 173c. For the yoke of necessity cf. Nem. VIII.6; h. Cer. 216-7 (with Richardson *ad loc.*); Bacch.11.46 καρτερᾷ ζεύξασ’ ἀνάγκαι (with Maehler 1982 *ad loc.*; Nem. VIII.3). Cf. A. Ag. 218.

⁶³. Cf. *Paroemiographi Graeci* vol.I: Diogen. VII.84 πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζεις= δῆλη ἡ παροιμία. Doubtless of immemorial antiquity in Greece: Zenob. V.70.α. παροιμία ἣς μέμνηται Εὐριπίδης... Αἰσχύλος. cf. also Greg. Cyr. III.46. (AD XIII); Apost. XVI.86; VI.57 (AD XV); Arsen.413 *ibid.*; Macar. VII.44 (AD XV); Greg. Naz. Christ Pat. 2266; Aeschyl. Ag. 1624; Prom V. 323; Eurip. Bacch. 794; fr.604 N². For the meaning of the proverb has been offered two interpretations: a. The scholiast (Pyth. II.173a), thinks of the use of the goad for the oxes during the ploughing. b. Carey (1981: *ad loc.*) believes that the image is taken from the use of sword or spear.

⁶⁴. Cf. Gentili 1995: *ad loc.*

⁶⁵. The symbol of οἶμος (v. Frisk and Chantraine, s.v. οἶμη) was used in various ways in Greek thought. See Becker 1937: 68-85. Cf. Harriott 1969: 53; Snell 1975: ch.13. For the Pindaric use as a symbol for poetry cf. Ol. VI.22-4, Pyth. XI.38-9, Nem. VI.53-4, as well as Bacch.19.1-2 (with Maehler 1982: *ad* 5.31).

⁶⁶. A. Ag. 1624 πρὸς κέντρα μὴ λάκτιζε, μὴ παίσας μαγῆις; Pr. 323. For the use of the proverb in tragedy see Buchwald 1939: II.

Pindar did not advise infringement of the law. He finds an analogy between the action of φθονεροὶ and the violent behaviour of Heracles, and on the base of this similarity he quotes in a metaphorical sense Pindar's words in the context of his discussion about the obedience to the law.⁶⁷

The order of both quotations in Aristides is that of the original text, from which only the first (Il.94-5), was known to the paroemiographic tradition,⁶⁸ whereas the second is cited only by Aristides.

Aristotle in his *rhetorica* (2.21 p.1395b.15), considers very appropriate the use of a γνωμικόν at the end of orator's *argumentatio*, since the orator with his gnome hits upon the opinion that the readers themselves have about this particular instance (*i.e.* the sense of absurdity here). They feel in some way a sort of satisfaction seeing that the orator agrees with them. Aristides echoes Aristotle's instructions, when he resorts to Pindar's gnome as it was commonly cited.⁶⁹ Omitting all the subordinate details from Pindar's context, Aristides quotes only these two striking expressions to impress his reader. The second gnome is presented as an explanation of the first one and both together in the rhetorical terminology represent an ἐνθύμημα.⁷⁰

Aristides in this polemical treatise cites Pindar not for stylistic embellishment but to show that Plato's views are based on a fallacy. His argument consists of two parts:

⁶⁷. Pindar by the time of his latest datable poem becomes conscious that his ideal is something broader and juster, less violent, than any form of repressiveness. In his invocation to *Hesychia* argues: "precious is the gain that one bears away from the house of a willing giver".

⁶⁸. Aristides' contemporary Zenobius V.50 (AD 130), preserves the infinitive form λακτίζειν and the main preposition πρὸς instead of the Pindaric ποτὶ (: against), and in this respect agrees with Aristides' paraphrase.

⁶⁹. Is it probable that Aristides actually had in mind Aristotle's rhetoric theory in applying what had been an Aristotelian instruction? Aristides quotes four times from *rhetoric* in *Ors.* XXVIII.85-6; VIII.21; XI.64. We know that elements (at least) of Aristotle's *rhetorica* are known at that time, and it is evident that Cicero has some knowledge of Aristotle's *rhet.* when he writes the *Orator*, in 55 BC (probably from the edition of Tyrannion and Andronicus). The discussion on 'invention' (*Orat.* 2.114-306) has a definite Aristotelian sound in it, and Aristotelian influences are more than evident in the tripartite division of the duties, the *officia* of the orator – to prove, to delight and to move – which are then associated with the three kinds of style: 'plain', 'middle' and 'grand'. Quintilian knew of Aristotle's *rhet.* (*IO* 12.17.14). Indeed, of two editions of *rhet.* available at the time, one with the two books and one with the three he seems to have in mind the latter. However, even if Aristotle's *rhet.* was known between 300 BC and AC 100, new developments on the subject had made it obsolete, and when Alexander Aphrodisiensis published the *corpus*, assigning the *rhetoric* among the books of the *Organon*, as a logical tool, it received scant attention. (See Kennedy 1991: 306-7).

⁷⁰. Arist. (*Rh.* 1394 α-β) explains that when a gnomic is followed by an explanation it forms an ἐνθύμημα. Some gnomic statements need more illustration with a striking word (cf. ὀλισθηρός οἶμος).

1. Aristides, considering that Plato (Callicles) misunderstood Pindar's treatment of Heracles in *fr.* 169a.1-8, quotes two fragments from his poetry (*fr.* 81 & *fr.* 169a.16-7) in order to substantiate his claim that even Pindar himself did not endorse Heracles' unprovoked attack and consequently the defence of one's property is legitimate.

2. In the second part of his argumentation, the orator portrays Pindar's attitude towards the law as being in accordance with the main *dogma* of the art of oratory.⁷¹ (*i.e.* Pindar advocated obedience to the law and considered the opposite in a metaphorical sense, as futile [*Pyth.* II. 94-5] and mere absurdity [*ib.* 96]).

The Pindaric νόμος in the tradition of Plato and Aristides

Throughout his speech Callicles focuses upon “justice” (τὸ δίκαιον) as defined by nature. Aristides, defending rhetoric against Plato's criticism, supports the “*civic law*”. Callicles clearly propounds that νόμος is always the right of the physically stronger, a position which seems far from what Pindar implies; the latter tries to make allowance for Heracles' violent behaviour by appealing to νόμος understood in a way that seems to justify it, despite reservations arising from customary condemnation of the initiator of acts of aggression, whereas the former clearly supports the “*law of nature*” as justifying eo ipso any act of aggression.

Aristides' choice of words is noteworthy because it suggests that he is carefully selecting terms which make his argument cohesive; in his view the art of oratory endorses the equality of all men and therefore only the first couplet of the Pindaric quote is acceptable. For him there is no place for ῥητορική or λόγοι, if justice is defined as force and the man of “superior strength” (cf. Heracles) disregards the civic law and social conventions (§228).

We can notice especially how the accumulating present infinitives in §231 build up to the accusative παρανομίαν. In such writing we may feel the force of Aristides' determined reaction to Plato's views. Aristides concludes with the forceful argument that at any rate, whether Pindar meant what Plato's Callicles takes him to mean, or (which is

⁷¹ *Or.* II.232 τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ δόγμα τῆς ῥητορικῆς καὶ τούτῳ σύνεστι τῷ νόμῳ καὶ περὶ τούτου πείθει τηροῦσα ὅπως μηδεὶς ὑπερβήσεται, τοὺς ὑπερβαίνοντας σωφρονίζουσα.

more probable for Aristides) he was just indignantly speaking (ὥσπερὲι σχετλιάζων) and not seriously advising, rhetoric's stance is clear as to what is called νόμος and what is called lawlessness. The last argument serves as a bridge leading to a concluding statement of purpose for Aristides' art delineating rhetoric's ethos, as an intrinsically moral endeavour. But the Platonists of his time and certainly those in Pergamum,⁷² would have here the opportunity to see that their master had been unfair to rhetoric, which not only was not a vain enterprise of flattery, but was actually siding with (Platonic) philosophy in being an *ancilla justitiae*, supporter of justice and lawfulness.

Aristides' rhetoric (and indeed the rhetoric rivalling philosophy with its educational claims in the times of the second sophistic) sides closer to Platonic conceptions of philosophy as a moral educator.⁷³ Aristides' dismissive reference to Callicles' (mis)use of Pindar serves as a reminder of the distance, indeed the opposition between the spurious, base form of rhetoric as understood by Plato to be used by the sophists of his time, and (the genuine form of) rhetoric during the age of the second sophistic which comes closer to philosophy.⁷⁴ Indeed appeal to the distinction between genuine form and base/corrupt form (of rhetoric), and the "ideal form" implied hereby as a paradigm for the genuine kind has a distinct Platonic undertone.⁷⁵

⁷² Platonists in Aristides' times would have found in him an opponent of their master's virulent attack against rhetoric and the sophists. Behr's conviction (1986: vol.I. 419) that Aristides also has in mind particularly the (middle) Platonists of Pergamum, identified by him as the School of Caius must be measured against the sweeping attack against the dubious evidence for the existence of such a "phantom" school that is supposed to have created a tradition in Pergamum (cf. Dillon 1996: 266-340, esp. 337-40). That Aristides did have in mind his contemporary Platonists is evidenced in his *Or.* III (see esp. 2, 7, 10, 624, 634 and 645-53), which reminds of the line of defence Aristides also kept in *To Capito* against the Platonists ("those who will be vexed for the sake of Plato"). Karadimas (1996: 31, n.143), contends that, in composing his last and longest Platonic discourse, Aristides was trying to protect himself from a possible backlash from the Platonists. Bear in mind that Apuleius, does recount his master's position on rhetoric in *De Platone* (dated AD 170). There he draws from *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus* in which Plato distinguishes between the noble kind of Rhetoric which contemplates the Good, and the "science of flattery, divorced of Reason". Michel (1993: 24-6) finds in Aristides' distinction between the genuine form of things which are kept in relation to their formal ideal as the genuine art of eloquence and the more base forms, a platonic trait, suggestive of his attempts at unifying philosophy and rhetoric on a rather platonic platform.

⁷³ For example it is preoccupied with answering 'τί ἔστι' questions concerning the nature of justice and educating people to accept justice and obey the law.

⁷⁴ Aristides styles himself as an orator, a rhetor and not the sophist. Indeed, he had no respect at all for the sophists.

⁷⁵ Michel (1993: 26) claims Platonic ideas guide Aristides' attempt to conciliate sophistic and philosophy. He finds that in the *Isocratique* doctrine Aelius Aristides has sensed the possibilities to conciliate between the Sophistic tradition and the teachings of the Academy, a possibility whose kernel ideas are found already in certain aspects of Cicero's argumentation.

The source of Aristides for *fr.*169a.1-8; 16-7; *fr.*81; *Pyth.* II.94-5; 96

Aristides appears to be meticulous in citing with great accuracy *fr.*169a.1-8 in the form in which it is quoted in *Gorgias*.⁷⁶ A purposeful misinterpretation of Pindar's words on the part of Plato attributed to Callicles, could afford Aristides no intelligible ground for an accusation against Plato's theory on the real value of oratory. Therefore it is probable that Aristides had verified the authenticity of Plato's quotation before he got involved in criticising Plato for inconsistencies and misconception of the meaning of the lines as intended by Pindar.

Aristides' use of Pindaric quotations emerges as important for four reasons:

1. The fact that Aristides quotes the lines 16-7 of *fr.*169a in paraphrase, is a proof that he used a text of Pindar similar to that discovered in Oxyrhynchos –dated in the 1st or early 2nd cent. AD. Therefore it seems almost certain that he verified Plato's quote, since his knowledge of *fr.*169a is not exclusively derived from *Gorgias*, but is independent.⁷⁷ When Aristides was composing §§226-31, next to his copy of *Gorgias* he could have had a copy of Pindar's poems.

2. He is our solitary authority for Pindar's *fr.*81.

3. Aristides provides the valuable information that *fr.*81 comes from a “*dithyramb*” (ἐν διθυράμβῳ τινί), in which Pindar went on to praise Geryon's defensive attitude in comparison to that of Heracles. The dithyramb to which Aristides refers was entitled the “*Cerberus*”.⁷⁸

4. The citation of II.94-5 and 97 in their original order in *Pyth.* II, presenting the latter as an explanation of the former (cf. κέκληκεν), suggests the possibility that Aristides cited directly from Pindar's text.

⁷⁶. For such an important context an independent quotation would doubtless have been preferred. However, Aristides preferred to cite Pindar from *Gorgias* as a means to eliminate all possibility of being accused of falsifying Callicles' quote on grounds of his own expediency.

⁷⁷. It is confirmed that the papyrus contained the beginning of the poem (Lloyd-Jones 1972: 48).

⁷⁸. Cf. Wilamowitz 1922: 344.

III.1.ii Or.III. Πρὸς Πλάτωνα Ὑπὲρ τῶν Τεττάρων

Plato having established what the function of a true statesman is, reverts to the question, raised at *Grg.* 503c, of whether “*the Four Men*” (i.e. Themistocles, Kimon, Miltiades, Pericles) –as Aristides calls them– had improved their fellow citizens (515b6-517a6). Socrates claims that they did not, and that this is shown by the ingratitude with which the Athenians eventually treated each of them (*Grg.* 516a). Plato's attack on “the four men” must have shocked his contemporaries far more profoundly than his views on tragedy.

This passage was much criticised in antiquity and Aristides felt the need to justify the deeds of Themistocles, Kimon, Miltiades, and Pericles against Plato's attack in his *Or.* III “*Defence of the Four*”. The oration was written some time between AD 161-165 in Smyrna.¹

III.1.4 Aristid. 3, 37 (1,304 L.-B.) = Pind. *Fr.* 48.

Aristides starts the refutation of Plato's arguments by considering firstly Pericles' personality, since Plato undertook to examine him first (§11). Aristides is mentioned in a scholium on Demosthenes *In Aristocratem* (Dind., vol. IX, 1851, p.708,3-5) as also having written a declamation called “*Pericles*”.² Aristides tries to illustrate Pericles' image as it emerges from his course of action, making historical references to the way he treated the Athenian demos.³

Aristides' context

Aristides opposes Plato's devaluation of Pericles, presenting him instead as a man of great calibre and a prudent and temperate politician (§§32-3). At this point Aristides has launched a full-scale attack against Plato's slander. He reproaches Plato's inconsistency, complaining that on the one hand he tries to defame Pericles by holding him responsible for the inevitable Athenian disaster, while on the other hand not rebuking his “ἐταῖρος”

¹. For works of Plato used as historical sources in *Or.* III cf. Haas 1884: esp. 2-3. For the historical sources of *Or.* III in general, see *ib.* 95.

². “A rule has been given to us to solve all objections arising from worth when we speak against an illustrious person. Aristides also did this in the *Pericles*”; see *fr.* 120 in Behr *Aristides* 1986: vol.I. 423 (Appendix I).

³. Aristides' wording here is a reminiscence of Thucydides. His possible sources are: a. Th. II.13; 65 and b. Plut. *Per.* 20; cf. §§20; 24.

Alcibiades who having taken over the city, proceeded to instil it with such madness. (εἴθ' οὕτως ἐξέμηνεν §34).

According to the orator's views it is intolerable when Plato blames Pericles who in his association with Anaxagoras turned out better than Alcibiades, whereas Alcibiades having Socrates as a ἑταῖρος gained nothing [/ was useless] (§34).

III. (XLVI D.) ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΤΤΑΡΩΝ.

ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἡσυχάζοντάς τε καὶ τὸ ναυτικὸν θεραπεύοντας, τοῦτο | δ' ἦν 20
τὰ ὑπάρχοντα σώζοντας, καὶ ἀρχὴν μὴ ἐπικτωμένους ἔφη περιέσεισθαι, ὁ δὲ
τῶν τὰ πολλὰ πράττειν πεισάντων εἰς ἦν. ἐν οἷς ἄλλα τε | πολλὰ καὶ ὁ εἰς 1
Σικελίαν ἡμαρτήθη πλοῦς, ἐξ ὧν πλείους τῶν συμμάχων | τοὺς πολεμίους
36 ἐκτήσαντο καὶ τελευτῶντες ἀπήλλαξαν ὥς ἴσμεν. οὐκ οὖν | ὁ Περικλῆς ἦν ὁ
ποιήσας οἶδεῖν καὶ ὕπουλον εἶναι τὴν πόλιν, οὐδὲ δι' | ὃν τῶν ἀρχαίων
σαρκῶν, ὥς σὺ φῆς, ἐστερήθησαν, ἀλλ' ὁ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας | ἐπαύξων αὐτοῖς καὶ 5
τοῖς τῶν Ἐγεσταίων χρήμασι δελεάζων καὶ τὴν | Σικελικὴν τράπεζαν
προξενῶν, ἅτε καὶ αὐτὸς ὧν τοιοῦτος καὶ μηδαμοῦ | στῆναι τῶν ἐλπίδων
ἔων τὸν δῆμον, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ μακρότερ' αὐτοῖς ὧν | ἐβούλοντό τε καὶ ἐδέοντο
ὑποτιθεῖς καὶ τάναντία τῷ Περικλεῖ πολιτευόμενος, μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου
37 τελευτὴν. οὐκοῦν πρὶν τινα τῶν ἀντιπάλων ἐλεῖν, | ἓνα τῶν φίλων 10
θηρεύσας ἄγεις, καὶ πέπονθας ταύτῳ τῷ Πινδάρου | Πηλεῖ, ὃς τῆς τε
θήρας διήμαρτεν καὶ τὸν Εὐρυτίωνα φίλτατον ὄντα ἑαυτῷ |
προσδιέφθειρεν. τὸ δ' αὐτὸ κἀν τοῖς ὕστερον οἶμαι Ἀδράστῳ τῷ Γορδίου |
φασὶ συμβῆναι.

(Aristid. 3, 37 (1,303-4 L-B.))

In §35, Aristides draws a comparison between Pericles and Alcibiades, distinguishing the former's personality as the man who persuaded the Athenian demos that they would win if they remained inactive and cared for their naval force preserving their existing power. Alcibiades is illustrated as a greedy character encouraging an adventurous expansionist policy which ended in the Sicilian disaster.

In §36 Aristides refuting Plato's charge (*Grg.* 518d-519a) against Pericles points out more inconsistencies. The way Aristides refers to Plato suggests that he had a very intimate knowledge of Plato's work. He paraphrases Socrates' words directing his accusation against Alcibiades. It was not Pericles who caused the city to “οἰδεῖν” (swell)

and “ὑπουλον εἶναι” (fester)⁴ nor was it through him that they were deprived of their “ἀρχαίων σαρκῶν” (old flesh)⁵, but Alcibiades was the one who enlarged the Athenians' desires enticing them with the “*money of Segesta*” and recommending the “*Sicilian table*”⁶ without setting a limit to people's expectations.

Aristides' culminates his criticism in §37 where he attempts to demolish Plato's slanderous accusations against Pericles, by presenting them as ineffectual, since Plato's accusation would in fact equally apply to his friend Alcibiades.

Aristides illustrates this point by quoting two similar mythological incidents. The first comes from a lost Pindaric *hymn* about the accidental murder of Eurytion, from which Aristides quotes only one line, and the second is a brief reference to a similar case told by Herodotus about Adrastus' murder of Kroisos' son.

Aristides employing hunting vocabulary presents Plato as failing to capture his opponent (*i.e.* Pericles)⁷ and hitting his friend instead. On that point Plato's failure is paralleled with Peleus' unintentional murder of Eurytion. Just as Peleus caused unwillingly the death of his friend Eurytion, on the same ground Plato's defamation of Pericles hits his ἑταῖρος Alcibiades.

Aristides embellishes his refutation with a short indirect reference to Pindar's *hymn*, which is exploited as a *mythological exemplum* in order to deflect Plato's disparaging attack against Pericles. Aristides appears to have found a suitable parallel incident in Pindar's *hymn*, which in Aristides' context has as its purpose to make the reader see Plato's attitude towards Pericles in terms of Peleus' accidental killing of Eurytion.

⁴. Plato had used before (480b₂) this medical metaphor for the individual soul, now he applies it to the state. Cf. Dodds 1990: *ad loc.*

⁵. Cf. *Grg.* 518c προσάπολοῦσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἀρχαίας σάρκας. Cf. Dodds' view *ad loc.*: “original”, as τὰρχαῖα means “the original sum”, *i.e.* capital as distinct from interest.

⁶. It was a proverb, cf. *Paroemiographi Graeci* vol.II: Apost. XV.48 Σικελικὴ τράπεζα: ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγαν τρυφηλῶν, cf. Diogen. VIII.7; Greg. Cypr. III.68.

⁷. Cf. schol. *ad loc.* ὅπερ εἰώθει ποιεῖν ἐπὶ τῶν νέων ὁ Πλάτων. ἠθικῶς δὲ εἶπε τῶν φίλων, ὥς μὴ δυνηθέντος αὐτοῦ θηρᾶσαι τὸν Περικλέα.

Aristides' quotation of Pindar forms a unique indirect source which in connection with the testimony preserved by his scholia enables us to get an idea of the hymn's content, even though Aristides paraphrases only a few words.

Pind. fr.48 in Schol. Aristid. 3,463-4 Dind.

125.11. ἐν ὕμνοις Πίνδαρος μέμνηται ὅτι τὸν Εὐρυτίωνα, τὸν τοῦ Ἴρου τοῦ 25
Ἄκτορος παῖδα, ἓνα ὄντα τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν, συνθηρεύοντα ἄκων
ἀπέκτεινε Πηλεὺς. φίλον δὲ λέγει, ἐπεὶ δὴ συγγενὴς τούτου ἦν. Πηλεὺς γὰρ
πρὸ Θέτιδος θυγατέρα Ἄκτορος τοῦ Πολυμήλου¹ εἶχε γυναῖκα. ὁ δὲ Ἄκτωρ
πατήρ Ἴρου, ὃς παῖδα ἔσχε τὸν Εὐρυτίωνα. ABD Oxon.

1. Πολυμήλαν BD. τὴν πολύμηλον Oxon.

(schol. Aristid. 3,463 Dind.)

The third person singular verb *μέμνηται* (= mentions) presupposes that the scholiast had a personal knowledge of what Pindar had said in his *hymn*, and illustrating Aristides' words, he quotes very briefly and in general outlines the subject-matter of what Pindar had treated in his unidentifiable *hymn*. So he probably knew Pindar's version of the shooting of the Calydonian boar, when Peleus inadvertently killed Eurytion.

The mythological explanations that the scholiast offers in his attempt to illustrate Aristides' phrase (πέπονθας ταῦτόν τῳ Πινδάρου Πηλεῖ, ... προσδιέφθειρεν), make his testimonies valuable for two main reasons:

1. The scholia preserve more information about the general context of the Pindaric *hymn* than Aristides does, since Aristides adapts only a small part into his context.

2. The evidence of the scholia forms an independent source from which we are in a position to speculate to what extent Aristides' quotation was close to the original context as well as if it fits into his argumentation in supporting Pericles' personality.

Peleus was a key figure in early Greek myth⁸. For Pindar Peleus' achievements with their connections with Aegina held a particular importance. All episodes from Peleus' life agree with Aristides' paraphrase as far we can tell in general outlines:

⁸. See Peleus' detailed study in March 1987: 20-22.

a. Son of *Irus* and *Demonassa* and a grandson of *Actor*, Eurytion is mentioned among the Argonauts (Hygin. *Fab.* 14; A.R. I.71).⁹

b. When Peleus was expelled from his dominions,¹⁰ he fled to *Eurytion* to whom he was related by his marriage to his first wife (*fr.* 48). Here Peleus' wife is called *Polymela*,¹¹ daughter of Actor.¹²

c. Peleus, while hunting,¹³ unintentionally killed *Eurytion*.¹⁴

Aristides, making a reference to Pindar's *hymn*, adapts it to his argument in order to defend Pericles' honour since he has been defamed by Plato. He probably felt that there was too much derogatory literature against the Athenian leader which prompted him to support Pericles.¹⁵ He chooses Pindar to back up his ideas deeming him relevant to the point. The choice of Pindar is understandable because Athens and its glorious leadership held a dominant place elsewhere in his poetry and a reference to his poetry may appeal to Aristides' audience. The same romantic glorification of the Athenian past occurs in *Panathenaicos*.

Aristides, paraphrasing Pindar, introduces a deliberate alteration: he transmits the variant reading φίλτατον ὄντα instead of συγγενῆς τούτου, which is transmitted by his scholiast. The ancient scholia on (§38) explain his variation as φίλον δὲ λέγει, ἐπειδὴ συγγενῆς τούτου ἦν and then they explain the nature of the two characters' relationship. The key-point of the scholiast's testimony is the phrase φίλον δὲ λέγει. It is ambiguous who is the subject of the verb λέγει. If in the scholia the phrase φίλον δὲ λέγει refers to Aristides, then maybe Pindar used the word συγγενῆς. On the other hand, if the phrase φίλον δὲ λέγει refers to Pindar, then Pindar may have used either φίλον or φίλτατον and

⁹. According to others he was son of Actor, and he is also called Eurytus. (Apollod. I.8.2; Tzetz. *ad. Lycoph.* 175).

¹⁰. Peleus had to leave Aigina (*Nem.* V.7ff).

¹¹. In schol. Aristid. 3,463 Dind., one would expect the name of the girl which is in fact transmitted in two Mss *BD* Πολυμήλαν, whereas in a third one *Oxon.* the feminine article τὴν Πολύμηλον is also transmitted.

¹². For the different variations of the name of Peleus' wife as well as her relation to Eurytion cf. Pherek. 3F61 and Apollod. III.13.1: Antigone, daughter of Eurytion. Staphylos, schol. *Il.* 16.175: Eurydice, daughter of Actor. Eustath. on Hom. *Il.* 2.684 p.321.

¹³. συνθηρεύοντα (*fr.* 48); Apollod. III.13.2 specifies at the Calydonian Boar hunt, where we see Peleus named as a participant on almost all of the inscribed black-figure vases which depict the hunt.

¹⁴. He killed his father-in-law (Apollod. III.13.1&c).

¹⁵. **Dodds** (1990: 325), claims that: "the memory of Pericles and Themistocles had indeed been blackened by oligarchic pamphleteers like Stesimbrotus of Thasos"; (cf. *FGrH* ii B *fr.* 107).

the scholia then explain why Aristides called him φίλτατον because he was συγγενής τούτου. This seems more likely after μέμνηται Πίνδαρος.

III.1.5 Aristid. 3, 478 (1,456 L.-B.) = Pind. Fr. 260.

After the “Common Defence” of the *Four Men* (§§352-457), which is a potpourri of unfavourable judgements on Plato's logic and inconsistencies, and of slanderous stories about his life, and before the presentation of Demosthenes' praise of the *Four* (§§499-510), Aristides in §§458-98 dwells on the power of Fate and circumstance, as well as the limitations of human skill.

Aristides' context

Within a series of twelve quotations, the majority of them from *Iliad* book 23, Aristides argues that in the athletic games in honour of Patroclus Homer indicates that Fate twists human affairs wherever it wishes and that the prizes of victory do not always belong to the best (§469). Nothing human is firm or goes smoothly or is self-sufficient; but the strong man will be inferior to the weakling, whenever the occasion calls for this (§473), however, it does not eventually deprive him of his whole reputation.

For someone to prevail over everything and to excel in physical strength has no meaning for him if the gods do not approve,¹ and he will always be subject to fortune. The point is illustrated with a quotation from Plato's *Laws* 709b ὡς θεὸς μὲν καὶ τύχη πάντ' ἄγουσιν (§474).

At this point Aristides reverts to poetry, which he considers useful in many respects; the poets are presented as agreeing with his reasoning especially in reminding us of our nature. This is justified with two quotations, one from Pindar, who called the human race “ἐφημέρους”² and the other from Homer, who called them “χαμαὶ ἐρχομένους”.³

¹ Aristides holds that Plato's remark in *Laws* 803c proves true τὸ ἀνθρώπον εἶναι θεοῦ παίγνιον.

² The possible source must be either *Pyth.* VIII.95, or *fr.* 182. Both passages are quoted by Aristides qualifying humans. (Cf. the discussion on p.189ff., and on p.248ff.). Consequently it seems likely that Aristides had in mind Pindar's word. The ἐφήμερος has a special meaning for the lyric poets with reference to human affairs. The epithet firstly occurred in epos; already in *Odyssey* (21.85), thoughts are expressed on the theme of human inability and the ‘ἐφήμερον’. See the detailed study of Fränkel 1968: 23ff. Fränkel's view has been questioned by Dickie 1976: 7ff., who points out that the adjective ἐφήμερος does not yet exist for Homer, and that when used by Pindar and other archaic and classical period poets to describe the human condition, it most likely means ‘lasting for a day’, short-lived.

³ Homer pointing out that “there is no similarity between the races of gods and men” (*Il.* 5.440-2), gives a dismissive description of men as χαμαὶ ἐρχομένων, that “walk on the ground”, (cf. χαμαιγενέων), see Kirk 1990: *ad loc.*

Aristides stresses the didactic value of the poets in destroying our false pride in every way. The orator appeals to the sagacity of the people who are invited to guard against criticism of inferiors' fortunes and against θρασεῖς if they are successful.

Aristides' text (§§476-82) has a technical character and it mainly consists of a compilation of various aspects of Palamedes' myth. Special emphasis is laid on the main issue of Palamedes' trial ('δικαστική παγίδευσις'), the hero's attributes and inventions, and the inconsiderate fashion in which he was finally treated by the Achaeans. The narration is suddenly interrupted at §477, where Aristides adopts a more compact style. He omits purposely the cause of trial ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν δικῶν πῶς εἶχεν ἐξ ἀρχῆς; moving to what he considers as more important.

III. (XLVI D.) ΥΠΕΡ ΤΩΝ ΤΕΤΤΑΡΩΝ.

476 νῦν δ' οἱ ποιηταὶ πολλὰ |
 χρήσιμοι κάνταῦθα πρόσκεινται καὶ παρακολουθοῦσιν ἡμῖν, ὑπομιμνή-
 σκοντες αἰετὴς φύσεως, ἐφημέρους τε καλοῦντες καὶ χαμαὶ ἐρχομένους, | καὶ 5
 πάντα τρόπον τὴν ἀλαζονείαν καθαιροῦντες, ὅπως μὴδ' εἴ τις εὖ | πράττειν
 δοκοίη, τούτῳ θρασύνοιτο, μὴδ' ἑτέρῳ πταίσαντί που προφέροι | τὴν τύχην
 477 ῥαδίως. καὶ τί δεῖ τᾶλλα λέγειν ὥς ἔχει; Ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν δικῶν | πῶς εἶχεν ἐξ
 ἀρχῆς; ἔλθωμεν γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτὸ τὸ κυριώτατον ἤδη. ὁ Παλαμῆδης σοφώτα-
 τος ὢν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐάλω τὴν δίκην τῆς προδοσίας. καὶ | οὐκ ἐρεῖς ὥς 10
 ἐκείνου γε Ἀθηναῖοι κατεψηφίσαντο. ἀλλὰ πᾶσα μὲν ἡ | Ἑλλάς συνεληλύθει,
 ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ κρίσις ἐν μέσῳ, καὶ ἀδικεῖν [δ'] | ἔδοξεν, ὅτι δὲ οὐχὶ δικαίως
 478 ἔδοξεν αὐτὸς σὺ λέγεις ἐν Σωκράτους | ἀπολογίᾳ. καίτοι τίς οὐκ ἂν φήσειεν
 οὕτως πολλὴν εἶναι τὴν ἀλογίαν, | ὄντα μὲν αὐτὸν κυριώτερον τοῦ
 Ὀδυσσεώς εἰς σοφίας λόγον, ὥς ἔφη Πίνδαρος, εἴθ' ἡττηθῆναι τοῦ 15
 χείρονος, καὶ ταῦτ' οὐκ εἰς χειρῶν κρίσιν | οὐδ' εἰς ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον ἐλθόντος
 τοῦ πράγματος, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο | ἐν ᾧ κρείττων ἦν; αὐθις δ' αὖ τοὺς
 Ἀχαιοὺς οὕτω πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα | ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πεπονθότας εὖ, δι' ἃ καὶ
 φιλεῖν καὶ θαυμάζειν αὐτὸν προσῆκεν, | εἴθ' οὕτως ἀγνώμονα καὶ ἀνόμοιον
 ἀποδοῦναι τὴν χάριν, ὅς γε καὶ σπουδαίων καὶ τῶν εἰς ψυχαγωγίαν 20
 ἡγεμῶν αὐτοῖς ἐγεγόνει σχεδὸν ἀπάντων;

(Aristid. 3,476-478 (1,456 L.-B.))

Aristides' arguments consist of two rhetorical questions with which he points out what he considers as unreasonable in Palamedes' myth. The first question concerns what

is absurdity (ἀλογία) in hero's fortune and action, whereas the second one refers to the unjustified and unreasonable behaviour (ἀτοπία) of the Achaeans towards his benefactions.

Aristides' intention is to draw a parallel between Palamedes and the Athenian leaders. This is clearly stated at §482, where he asserts that Palamedes, Miltiades and Pericles share in common defence what he has already propounded that “*fortune and circumstance guide men's activity*”.

Aristides does not follow any of the known versions, where Odysseus or Diomedes were responsible for Palamedes' death, but he speaks generally of all the Greeks⁴ (κατεψηφίσαντο), avoiding specifying Odysseus' δόλος (cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 105; schol. Eur. *Or.* 432.8) and also the kind of penalty that the Achaeans imposed on Palamedes.⁵

Odysseus' δόλος was finally successful, resulting in Palamedes' conviction. The expression εἶθ' ἡττηθῆναι τοῦ χείρονος refers to both the whole process of Palamedes' entrapment, as well as his conviction. Aristides makes mention of the judicial proceedings that were followed πᾶσα μὲν ἡ Ἑλλάς συνεληλύθει, ἐγένετο δὲ ἡ κρίσις ἐν μέσῳ, and Palamedes was found guilty.⁶

At §478 Aristides protests pointing out a logical inconsistency:

(478) “*who would not say that the situation was very unreasonable, that a man who was superior to Odysseus in respect to wisdom, as Pindar said, was defeated by his inferior, and at that although the circumstance did not concern a physical contest,⁷... but a matter in which he was better?*”.

The authorship of the quotation is clearly stressed. The first half of the quoted line is preserved in a papyrus fragment P. Harr. 21, containing mutilated words of fr. 260.

4. The tradition of the testimonies falls within two main categories: **a.** those who stress the role of Agamemnon in the administration of justice (Apollod. *Epit.*, Hyg.), and **b.** those who lay special emphasis on the evidence (schol. Eur.). Aristides sides himself with the latter tradition.

5. Cf. schol. Eur. *Or.* 432.9 λιθοβολισμός.

6. On this point Aristides has in mind Plato's opposition about the blameworthy of Palamedes (ὅτι δὲ οὐχὶ δικάως ἔδοξεν) cf. Pl. *Ap.* 41b ἐπεὶ ἔμοιγε καὶ αὐτῷ θαυμαστὴ ἂν εἴη ἡ διατριβὴ αὐτόθι, ὁπότε ἐντύχοιμι Παλαμῆδει καὶ Αἴαντι τῷ Τελαμῶνος καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλος τῶν παλαιῶν διὰ κρίσιν ἄδικον τέθνηκεν, ἀντιπαραβάλλοντι τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πάθη πρὸς τὰ ἐκείνων - ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι.

7. It is also probable that he knew Alcibiades' *Od.* 3-8 καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἐν παλαίστρᾳ οὐδ' ἐν συμποσίῳ, ἔνθα φιλεῖ ἔριδας πλείστας καὶ λοιδορίας γίγνεσθαι, from where he may have taken this expression.

Pindar Fr. 260

The *editio princeps* of the papyrus was made by J.E. Powell in his 1936 edition of *The Rendel Harris Papyri of Woodbrooke College*, no.21.⁸

FR. 260 (178).

...
 τιν' ἐλεγχο[
 κρυφίου δὲ λό[γου
 ἀνίατον εἰ[
 λεν χαλεπα[
 5 Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ π[
 παιδὶ δικτυ[
 κυριώτερό[εἰς σοφίας λόγον
 ἀθρέων ἀν[
 τον[
 10 διο[
 μεσ[
 αδυ[
 φέρον[
 ...

I. Π¹³: P. Harr. 21.

II. Aristid. 3,478 (1,456 L.-B.)'

With Pindar we enter into a new conception of “ethos”. He detests deeds of violence and praises Palamedes' inventions, whose σοφία he opposes to the traditional epic view of μῆτις. In this nexus of ideas he admires Palamedes who served human civilisation, favouring him over Odysseus in terms of his σοφία.⁹

As far as we can tell from Proclus' paraphrase of the *Cypria*, there is no suggestion that Palamedes was qualified as σοφός before Pindar.¹⁰ The fragmentary form of *Cypria* (the only preserved recruitment-episode of Odysseus),¹¹ does not allow us to speculate further.¹²

⁸. For a critique of Powell's edition see Snell 1937: 577-86.

⁹. We can assume that Pindar considered Odysseus' φθόνος as the main cause of Palamedes' assassination. In Aristides' account the responsibility of Palamedes' death lies on all Achaeans, cf. Eur. fr.588N ἐκάνετ' ἐκάνετε τάν πάνσοφον, ὦ Δαναοί.

¹⁰. Pindar attacks Odysseus in *Nem.* VIII.

¹¹. A summary of the contents of the *Cypria* was preserved by Proclus, and an epitome of his *Chrestomathia* was included in Photius' *Bibliotheca*.

¹². The Pindaric expression was followed by X. *Cyn.* 11,1 Παλαμήδης δὲ ἕως μὲν περιῆν πάντων τῶν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ ὑπερέσχε σοφία. Cf. also Polyæn *Strategem.* 1.12 Παλαμήδην ἐνίκησεν (Ὀδυσσεύς) ἐν δικαστηρίῳ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ... καὶ ὁ σοφώτατος ἐκεῖνος ἦλω προδοσίας δόλῳ καὶ στρατηγήματι.

The place of *fr.* 260 in Aristides' context suggests that Pindar was aware of Palamedes' κρίσις and also of his death.¹³

Various *inventions* are attributed to Palamedes from which Aristides chooses to present three (§479):¹⁴

1. The hero had been their guide in nearly all serious and recreational activities.¹⁵
2. The art of tactics (his greatest single invention, deserving the highest honour).
3. The invention of numbering.

In a playful style Aristides quotes in the form of paraphrase two fragments:¹⁶ one from Aeschylus [*Palamedes*] *fr.* 181a Radt, that “*they differed not at all from cattle before their association with him*”;¹⁷ for the other Aristides has in mind a passage from *Respublica* (522d2), where Plato jesting observes that Palamedes enabled Greeks to count their ships, kings, hands, and feet.¹⁸

Aristides, at §480 just before the propounded equation of Pericles to Palamedes, points out in a second rhetorical question both the ungratefulness of the Achaeans in not recalling his great kindness in order to save him, and the astonishing fact that in spite of his unique wisdom in the defence of the others and invention of all contrivances, he did not defend himself.

Aristides on this point follows the tradition where Palamedes did not support himself in his ‘δίκη προδοσίας’. This can lead us to assume that the agon-scene was not

¹³. It is unknown whether this version was Pindar's invention, or adopted from another part of the tradition of the myth. *Aélion* (1983: 57-8), thinks that he borrows it from Aeschylus.

¹⁴. For a detailed study of the myth of Palamedes and its testimonies see *Zographou-Lyra* 1986. For Palamedes' inventions see 224-43. Many contrivances were attributed to Palamedes so that his name became identical with cleverness and inventiveness. In this sense Plato calls Zeno (*Phdr.* 261d) 'Ελεατικὸν Παλαμήδη, (cf. D.L. 9.25). Eupolis *fr.* 385 *PCG*, calls a contrivance as παλαμηδικόν γε τοῦτο τούξεύρημα; schol. *Ar. Ra.* 1451.

¹⁵. The recreational character of Palamedes' invention is also stressed by Soph. *τερπνὸν ἀργίας ἄκος*. This passage, according to *Szarmach* (1975: 257-8), is followed by Gorgias in his *Ὑπὲρ Παλαμήδους Ἀπολογία*.

¹⁶. *Radt* (*TrGF* III 181a), argues that it was not Aristides who paraphrases but Plato *R.* 522d (this had already been suggested by *Haas* in 1884: 87ff.).

¹⁷. *A. Fr. TrGF* III 181a <ΠΑΛ.> ἔπειτα πάσης 'Ελλάδος καὶ ξυμμάχων βίον διώκησ' ὄντα πρὶν πεφυρμένον θηρίῳ θ' ὅμοιον· πρῶτα μὲν τὸν πάνσοφον ἀριθμὸν ἤρην· ἔσχατον σοφισμάτων.

¹⁸. *Pl. R.* 522 d2 Παγγέλιον γοῦν, ἔφην, στρατηγὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις Παλαμήδης ἐκάστοτε ἀποφαίνει. ἢ οὐκ ἐννεόηκας ὅτι φησὶν ἀριθμὸν εὐρῶν τάς τε τάξεις τῷ στρατοπέδῳ καταστήσαι ἐν Ἰλίου καὶ ἐξαριθμησαὶ ναῦς τε καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα, ὥς πρὸ τοῦ ἀναριθμητῶν ὄντων καὶ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, ὥς ἔοικεν, οὐδ' ὅσους πόδας εἶχεν εἰδότες, εἴπερ ἀριθμεῖν μὴ ἠπίστατο;

included in an early version of the myth and especially in that of *Cypria* and Pindar, otherwise it would be mentioned by the later testimonies.¹⁹

Aristides' quotation acquires special importance since it serves as a basis for wider reflections. It is integral to his argument in supporting Pericles' personage against Plato's slanders. In *Or. II* Aristides quotes *Ol. II.86-8* suggesting unequivocally the equation of σοφός to ῥήτωρ; in this respect, Aristides coins a new compliment for Pericles who is praised as [σοφός] ῥήτωρ. Palamedes was superior to Odysseus in respect to wisdom. This also applies to Pericles whose "*clan shares in Palamedes' fate to the extent of the contest not going as they wished and of being worsted by their slanders*" (§481).

Aristides, equating Pericles to Palamedes, appends a different connotation to the meaning of σοφία from that which was originally intended by Pindar in *fr. 260*. The surface meaning seems to imply a more technical skilfulness and contrivance. Aristides propounds an additional meaning, that of oratorical persuasion. It is that which the Athenian statesmen used in avoiding Palamedes' disastrous fall, taking a more gentle one, and in this respect he was wiser than Palamedes (§481).

The source for Pind. *Fr. 260*

The papyrus scrap containing *fr. 260* is extensively mutilated on its right side so we are unable to get an insight of what Pindar said. Aristides' quotation as well as the context of his speech in which he preserves the main aspects of the myth, are precious in deciding on the nature of *fr. 260*. The accuracy of Aristides' quotation is proved from the first half of *l.7*, where clearly we read κυριώτερο[, which coincides with Aristides' κυριώτερος, and the following quoted words λεις σοφίας λόγον might be what Pindar had indeed written.²⁰

¹⁹. In Philostr. *Her.* 33, 30 Palamedes speaks to jurors. The agon of Palamedes was probably treated in tragedy in the homonymous tragedies of Aeschylus and Sophocles, but scholars do not agree on which of the preserved fragments belong to Palamedes' defence, see Jouan 1966: 349-50 with ns.1,2; Webster 1967: 175.

²⁰. The text was supplemented by Snell (1937: 582), who also supplies *l. 6* παιδὶ δικτυ[βόλου.

This is the only preserved text where Pindar made mention of Palamedes comparing him to Odysseus in terms of his σοφία. Palamedes' name is not recorded in the extant papyrus fragment but it might well have been written at l.5, where only the initial Π is preserved, supplied by Snell π[αλαμήδει. Powell seems to have misinterpreted the content of the papyrus in suggesting the *hypothesis* of a tragedy, concerning either Odysseus and Achilles on Scyros, or Odysseus, Neoptolemus and Philoctetes, probably from l.3 ἀνίατον.²¹

The accumulation of 22 quotations in §§465-82 (14 from Hom., 4 from Pl., 1 from Aesch., and 3 from Pind.), suggests that Aristides employed in the construction of these paragraphs a wide range of sources. Aristides' technique in quoting them bears a strong resemblance with that in *Or.* II.92-113 where he defended his role as ῥήτωρ.

Aristides may have quoted *fr.*260 either from:

1. an original edition of Pindar, or from
2. a mythological *compendium*.

The possibility that Aristides employed a *mythological handbook*, is suggested by the fact that he epitomises the main points of Palamedes' myth.

On balance the use of an edition of Pindar is more likely on the following grounds:

a. The beginning of Aristides' quotation is identical with l.7 of P. Harr. 21: κυριώτερο[...] and this gives more weight to considering an original edition as the possible source.

b. In Aristides' account Odysseus is compared explicitly to Palamedes. If Snell's supplement on l.5 (Ὀδυσσεὺς δὲ π[αλαμήδει) is accepted, then the same comparison between both heroes seems to be recorded in P. Harr. 21, and this is also implied in the comparative κυριώτερο[. Therefore, it seems logical to conjecture the text of Pindar as Aristides' source.

²¹. Powell 1936: 15.

c. From the immense number of the extant literary sources, that were in wide circulation even in classical times, Aristides explicitly acknowledges use of the following ones in his presentation of the myth:

- i. Pindar *fr.*260.
- ii. Plato *Apology* 41b.
- iii. Aeschylus *fr.*181a Radt [*Palamedes*].²²
- iv. Plato *Republic* 522d.

The fact that Aristides kept close to the original in his other three quotations (ii, iii, iv), as can be seen from the direct tradition of the text, in these cases suggests that he did the same with his quote from Pindar.

It is unlikely that Aristides found all this information contained in a mythological handbook, (especially his references to Plato). The mythological handbooks in Aristides' time were similar in character to those written by Apollodorus and Hyginus. Then it seems likely that they have contained the basic facts of Odysseus—Palamedes story but hardly the circumstantial details which Aristides paraphrased from Aeschylus and Plato. Therefore it seems likely that Aristides in this case used an original edition.

The real value of Aristides' quotation consists in establishing the authorship of the papyrus text as Pindar's.

²². Apollodorus preserves the 'Υπόθεσις of Aeschylus' *Palamedes*, and Aristides may have quarried from here his information about the tragic treatment of the myth.

III. 2 QUOTATIONS AGAINST CONTEMPORARY 'SOPHISTS'

III.2.1 Aristid. 34(50), 2, 238, 10K = Pind. Fr. 226.

Introduction to *Or. XXXIV* (50) *KATA TΩN EZOPHOYMENΩN*

In January AD 170, the Provincial Assembly met in Smyrna.¹ Asclepius sent Aristides – (in a dream described in *Hieros Logos* 5 [51].38-40) –, to address the convocation in person. When his turn came,² in a speech delivered according to its subscription during the games of the Provincial Assembly, *Or. XXXIV* “Against those who lampoon (*The Mysteries of Oratory*)”,³ Aristides and his audience in the council chamber there took immense pleasure as he tells us at *Hieros Logos* 5 (51).38-41 in a vicious attack on orators who flattered the masses.

The debasement of oratory by his competitors was a theme most dear to him. The defence is imbued with a moral fervour similar in tone to *Or. XXXIII*, and passages from the time of his Cathedra (AD 145-147). This speech again expresses Aristides' conviction that oratory was pure and sacred like a *mystery religion* and that the orator was a *mystes*, an initiate into it.⁴

Philostratus classifies Aristides as a sophist, whereas throughout his life Aristides styled himself as an orator. Here, Aristides shows disregard for the title of “σοφιστής”⁵

¹ The ‘Provincial Assembly’ of Asia (Κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας) met annually in a four year cycle. For three of those four years the Κοινὸν met in the Metropolises Smyrna, Pergamum, and Ephesus, and on the fourth year in one of the remaining six cities; cf. Magie 1950: 1295 n.55. For the ‘Provincial Assembly’, see also Behr 1968a: 63 n.14 (Laodicea AD 147), 104 n.28 (Pergamum AD 167), 112-3 (Smyrna AD 178); and for the cycle of the Assembly meetings cf. *id.*, 1994: §7, The Electoral Procedure in τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας.

² Aristides' address was delayed because of his opponent Heraclides the Lycian, cf. *Hieros Logos* 5 (51).38, whom Aristides calls in a moment of fury “an obtuse custodian”.

³ Behr (1968a: 107 n.41), dated the speech on the basis of its subscription, whereas, Boulanger (1923: 162), unaware of this dates it in 153 AD.

⁴ The image of “initiation” into a mystery religion is a Middle Platonic commonplace, and Aristides borrowed it from the Platonizing philosophers of the period (Philo, Albinus, Heraclitus the author of *The Allegories of Homer*, ch.3), cf. Dillon 1996: 300. This conception arose during the frantic time of the Cathedra, and persisted throughout his career.

⁵ For the word as a term of insult in Aristides' orations, cf. all the instances collected by Behr 1968a: 106 n.39. In *Or. XXXII.8*, Aristides says that the title was “the most fearsome” that his teacher Alexandros did not feel important enough to take it. Philostratus *VS* 8.7,3 distinguished between “σοφιστής” and “ρήτωρ”, cf. Dio *Or. LX.10*; Epiphanius *Panar.* 1.185. In the context of the second century AD sophistic movement there is no clear distinction between the two terms. Rhetors were defined by their rhetorical skill and various roles ascribed to them like counsellors, politicians, and panegyrists, whereas by contrast the sophists were principally involved in teaching and they were criticised for taking money for that service, see Bowie 1982: 39. The sophists felt confident enough about their art to give public performances, as was the case also in the classical times. It is with these sophists of the fifth century BC that the sophists of the Roman era related their trade, although such a comparison, according to Bowie (1974: 169), is hardly warranted, “the claim of classical precedent on however slender a basis is itself symptomatic of the times”. Anderson (1990: 92), argues that the term σοφιστής was bedevilled

in its contemporary usage for himself; he uses it in a derogatory sense making it a term of abuse for contemporary rhetoricians, who indulged in disputatious and showy rhetoric for their own glory.⁶

Aristides' context

In the proemium (§1), Aristides rebukes them as charming people, who have broken all bounds of decorum, order, and rectitude in order to please their audience and enhance their own reputation.⁷

He argues that it is a feeble excuse when corrupt orators lay the blame for the poor quality of their speeches upon the masses. If the motive of their excuse is the *captatio misericordiae* (συγγνώμη), they should not be praised. Aristides very wittily alludes to l. 1415 from Sophocles' *Electra*, in order to illustrate in a metaphorical sense the ambiguous effect of the practice that the sophists adopted: he asserts that “they strike a double blow” διπλᾶ κρούουσιν (§2),⁸ so that if they escape detection they can win praise, but in case the audience apprehends them, they easily can take refuge in the excuse that they erred for the sake of others.

Aristides asserts that these arguments advanced by the sophists for their defence finally turn against them by bringing the following three charges:⁹

1. The sophists have adopted a wanton behaviour in their oratory,

with controversy throughout most of its history and it could be used ironically of dubious claimants. Swain (1996: 98 with n.93), is right in arguing that both terms overlap with each other, depending on the particular stress one wanted to achieve (cf. the instance of Antoninus Pius who treated both orators and sophists as teachers when he advises the Κοινόν of Asia of the number of ἀτέλεια that will be allowed these groups in cities). The legal evidence comes from Modestinus: Antoninus Pius, in the letter quoted from Commodus' edict (*Dig.* XXVII.1.6.8), says that Hadrian on his accession to the throne confirmed by edict τὰς ὑπαρχούσας τιμὰς καὶ ἀτελείας “to all these”. Pius identified their recipients later as philosophers, rhetors, *grammatici* and doctors (cf. *grammaticis et oratoribus et medicis et philosophis*); see Bowersock 1969: 33 with the corrections of Griffin 1971:279.

⁶. Aristides' views were influenced by the philosophic rhetoric of Isocrates. Cf. *Or.* III.677ff. with Isoc. *Against the Sophists*. Festugière 1969: 148-9 errs in suggesting that the word “σοφιστής” is used positively by Aristides.

⁷. This theme is exploited at length at §§48-62, where Aristides expresses the view that gratification of the audience shamefully debases the oratory itself.

⁸. The l. 1415 in *S. El.* runs: παῖσον, εἰ σθένεις, διπλῆν. The words are addressed ironically by Electra to Clytaemnestra, and mean ‘strike back if you can’. See Kells 1989: *ad loc.*; Linforth argues (1963: 109), that διπλῆν means a *matching*, a retaliating blow.

⁹. Aristides rebukes the abominable style and the wild gesticulations (§12) that the sophists employed in their speeches, which were replete with trivial themes, such as praise of bathing (cf. XXXIV.47), and, worse they incite their audiences to factious conduct. Aristides shows his abhorrence for their behaviour by comparing their conduct with that of prostitutes or with disgusting diseases (cf. XXXIV.47). Lucian also speaks in these terms in *Bis Acc.* 31. On all these cf. Behr 1968a: 107, with ns. 43 and 44.

2. they expect through this attitude to be judged as better speakers, and
3. they do not think that they are caught in the act when they seek to lead their audience astray, expecting the audience to believe their fabrications.

Over the next paragraphs (5-6), Aristides exhibits what he considers to be the truth of the matter. He starts with the common assumption that οὐδείς ἐκὼν μεθήσι τὸ βέλτιστον, and illustrates his views with three quotations, two from Pindar first and one from Plato, who according to the orator share the same views.

XXXIV. (50) ΚΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΕΞΟΡΧΟΥΜΕΝΩΝ.

τοσοῦτον δ' ἔμοιγε ἀπολογίας ἀπέχειν δοκοῦσιν, ὅταν | 22
ταῦτα λέγωσιν, ὥστε δύ' ἀνθ' ἑνὸς ποιεῖν τὰ ἐγκλήμαθ' ἑαυτοῖς, | ἐν μὲν εἰ | 1
τοιαῦτ' ἀσελγαίνουσιν περὶ τοὺς λόγους, ἕτερον δὲ εἰ | τούτου χάριν, ὡς
4 ταύτη βελτίους κριθήσεσθαι μέλλοντες. καὶ μὴν | ὅταν γε ὡς ἡμᾶς εὐθέως
πιστεύσοντας οἷς πλάττονται καὶ τάλῃ|θες οὐχὶ συνήσοντας παράγειν | 5
ζητῶσιν, ἄλλην αὖ τρίτην ταύτην | ἀμαθίαν ἐμφανίζουσιν, εἰ μὴ νομίζουσι
5 φωρᾶσθαι. τὸ δ', οἶμαι, | τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν. οὐδείς ἐκὼν μεθήσι τὸ βέλτιστον·
ἀλλ' οὐ | Πλάτων καὶ Πίνδαρος πολλαχῇ μὲν καὶ ἄλλῃ σοφοί, καὶ δὴ καὶ |
κατὰ τόνδε τὸν λόγον οὐχ ἥκιστα, ὁ μὲν οὕτως λέγων (frg. 226)· | 'Οὔτις | 10
ἐκὼν κακὸν εὔρετο· καὶ πάλιν ὁρμηθεὶς ἐκ τῶν περὶ τῆς | 'Εριφύλης λόγων
'Ὑ πόποι, φησὶν (frg. 182), οἷ' ἀπατᾶται | φροντὶς ἐπαμερίων οὐκ
εἰδυῖα· ὁ δ' ἄνω καὶ κάτω δῆπου δι|ορίζεται καὶ δείκνυσι τὰ ἀμαρτήματα
6 ὡς ἀκούσια καὶ ὅτι οὐδείς | ἐκὼν φαῦλος. μὴδ' ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ τούτων πειθώμεθα,
ὡς ἄρ' ἔχον|τές τι βέλτιον παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, εἴθ' ἐκόντες τοῦτ' ἀφέντες τὸ χεῖρον | 15
| ἀλλάττονται. οὐκ οὐκ χρυσόν γ' ἂν ἔχοντες ἡλλάττοντο μόλυβδον | ἀντ'
αὐτοῦ, οὐδ' εἰ πάντες ἀνθρωποὶ κροτήσιν ἔμελλον· οὐδὲ | μελίνην ἀντὶ
πυρῶν, οὐδ' ἀντ' οἴνου τρύγα καὶ ταύτην σαπράν, | οἶμαι δὲ οὐδὲ ψίαθον
ἀντὶ ξύστιδος, οὐδ' αὖ βύρσης ὄζειν, μύρων | ἐξόν.

(Aristid. 34 (50) 2,238,10&11-12 K).

Aristides in a corrupt text¹⁰ cleverly calls both authors σοφοί,¹¹ increasing in that way the authority of the following quotations, which are adduced as supportive evidence.

¹⁰. As we can judge from a supplement proposed by Keil to supplement Arethas' manuscript A = Laurentianus L X 3 (cf. Lenz-Behr, praef. VII) = Γ Ddf., which was written in AD 917 (cf. Lenz-Behr, praef. ed., XXVI-XXVIII), *lacunam indicavi sec. A*; e.g. ἀλλ' οὐ <δὲ τὸ χεῖρον προσίεται ἐκὼν καὶ τούτου μάρτυρες οὐχ οἱ τυχόντες, ἀλλὰ> Πλάτων κτέ; cf. v.14 sqq. It should be noted, however, that there is no authority for this supplement in A.

¹¹. It is a reminiscence of Plato's technique, who in *Prot.* (345e) makes Socrates attribute the belief to which Aristides refers, to wise men. It is probable that Aristides was influenced here by Plato.

The authorship of Pindar's quotation is testified explicitly, followed by a paraphrase from Plato (*e.g. Protag. 345e*).¹²

Aristides' wording (ὁ δ'... δείκνυσσι) clearly suggests that the ensuing words are Plato's: "*the faults are involuntary and that no one is willingly bad*". The gnomic phrase «οὐδεὶς ἐκὼν ἀμαρτάνει» became one of the key-points in the philosophical thought of the fourth century. It is a famous philosophic Socratic tenet, and the sort of material that a late antique author might find in *ὑπομνήματα* and philosophical handbooks.¹³

Pindar Fr. 226

Pindar's gnome is a slight variation on the οὐδεὶς ἐκὼν κακός-motif, which Aristides applies to his competitors. Aristides' text is our unique authority for *fr.226*, and consequently we depend on his interpretation.

FR. 226 (248).

οὐτίς ἐκὼν κακὸν εὔρετο

Aristid. 34 (50) 2,238,10 K. (*sequitur fr. 182 et Pyth. III.83*).

Pindar's gnome illustrates the *communis opinio* that "*no one willingly commits evil*".¹⁴

The references to Pindar and Plato act as foil for what Aristides wants to emphasise, namely that these people are indeed rhetors of poor quality and their contention that *they*

¹² The quotation is a paraphrase of the doctrine expressed in *Prot. 345e* that no one does wrong willingly – a corollary of the view that "vice is only ignorance", a characteristic of the ethical view of Socrates and Plato: οὐδένα ἀνθρώπων ἐκόντα ἐξαμαρτάνειν οὐδὲ αἰσχροῖα τε καὶ κακὰ ἐκόντα ἐργάζεσθαι, ἀλλ' εὖ ἴσασιν ὅτι πάντες οἱ τὰ αἰσχροῖα καὶ τὰ κακὰ ποιοῦντες ἄκοντες ποιοῦσιν. The words are the interpretation that follows after the quotation of Simonides' poem to Scopas. Socrates extends the meaning of the poem to make it support the view that the wise men believe that: anyone who does anything wrong or bad does so involuntarily. (Cf. *Grg. 488a3; R. 589c6*). This idea is echoed in Aristides' quotation of Socrates' belief. Socrates' adaptation of the poet's thought involves a blatant perversion of the plain sense of the poem, since he ascribes one of his philosophical tenets to Simonides. For a discussion of the meaning that Simonides intended and the interpretation of Socrates cf. **Demos** 1991: 32ff. **Frede** (1986: 746), interprets Socrates' intent as mischievous insofar that he is mocking encomiastic poets.

¹³ Cf. Olymp. in *Grg. 27.7* on 488a3: <"Οτι οὐχ ἐκὼν ἐξαμαρτάνω> ἰδοὺ ἀκούσια λέγει τὰ ἀμαρτήματα, ἐπειδὴ ἀκούσιον τὸ ψεῦδος; and Stob. 3, 9, 62 οὐ γὰρ ἐκὼν ἀμαρτάνει. Schol. *Ant.* 1340 ἐκὼν κάκτανον.

¹⁴ Plato's statement adds the presupposition that "*faults are involuntary*". By Pindar's time the phrase must have acquired already a proverbial value. For the meaning of ἐκὼν and ἄκων in early Greek thought, cf. **Rickert** 1989. For Pindar's use see 45, 57-8, 157.

possess better skills but willingly give these up in exchange for those that are worse, is a feeble excuse. Aristides draws a parallel between the practice of sophists and what is defined as ἐκών in *fr.* 226, trying to show that their argument runs counter to the common belief, and their allegations cannot stand, since their objective is the gratification of the audience and personal fame.

At §6 he warns the audience not to accept their excuse, but to be aware of its implications. He justifies the point on the common assumption that none would agree to exchange an item of superior quality with one of inferior.¹⁵

¹⁵. The compared elements are all from the material world in order to make the intended comparison comprehensible.

III.2.1 Aristid. 34(50), 2, 238, 11-2K = Pind. Fr.182.

Aristides attempts a second bridge to Pindar's poetry when he connects the behaviour of the corrupted sophists with a view that Pindar expressed in a lost poem where according to Aristides' testimony he treated the myth of Eriphyle καὶ πάλιν ὀρμηθεὶς ἐκ τῶν περὶ τῆς Ἐριφύλης λόγων:

FR. 182 (175).

ὦ πόποι, οἷ' ἀπατᾶται φροντὶς ἐπαμερίων
οὐκ ἰδυῖα

Aristid. 34 (50) 2,238,11-12 K. καὶ πάλιν ὀρμηθεὶς (scil. Pindarus) ἐκ τῶν περὶ τῆς Ἐριφύλης λόγων ὦ πόποι, φησὶν, οἷ' — εἰδυῖα (sequitur Pyth. III.83).

1 ἐπαμερίων ATR^s: ἐφαμερίων DURⁱ 2 εἰδυῖα codd.: ἰδυῖα Boeckh

The quoted fragment is a gnome, proverbial in effect, which generalises Pindar's views on the futility of human efforts that are destined to fail. In a pessimistic tone Pindar cries “*Alas, how the ignorant cares of short-lived men are deceived*”.¹⁶

We can assume from the meaning of the words that Pindar probably intended this gnome to illustrate the behaviour of Eriphyle in whose acts Aristides discerned a parallel to the corrupted practice of contemporary sophists.

The legend of Eriphyle is linked with the Theban cycle and the expedition of the Seven and the Epigoni.¹⁷ Therefore, it seems logical for the myth to have attracted Pindar's interest –due to the special connection with his city– more than once. According to the Greek myth, after Adrastus had been reconciled with his cousin Amphiaraus, the reconciliation was sealed by the marriage of Eriphyle to Amphiaraus. Eriphyle allowing herself to be influenced by Polynices' present of Harmonia's necklace, persuaded Amphiaraus to join the expedition. Amphiaraus made his son avenge his death. When the second expedition was being prepared, Eriphyle accepted a bribe from Polynices' son

¹⁶. For the meaning of “Ἐφήμερος” cf. p.235, n.2. The word here is in line with Sem. 1.3W(=1D). Cf. also Braswell's argument (1988: 130d), for the normal use of the aspirated form of the word by Pindar. “*But that ἐπαμερ- at Py. 8.95 and fr.182.1 is a conscious recollection of the use of the word in its unaspirated form at Sem. 1.3W*”. For the psilotic form see West 1974: 88-9.

¹⁷. Hom. *Od.* 11.326, 15.247-8; *Apollod.* 1.9.3, 3.6.2, 7.2; Hyg. *Fab.* 73; Plut. *Parallela Minora* 307A. 6A; Paus. 1.34.2, 3.15.6, 5.17.4; schol. *Nem.* IX.35b-d, *Pyth.* III.167a. We know from Suda that Nicomachus wrote a tragedy *Ἐριφύλη*.

(Thersandros), as she had done before to force her son Alcmeon to accept the command. On his way back Alcmeon killed Eriphyle.

Pindar might have intended these lines to illustrate the futility of Eriphyle's action, which finally turned against herself. On this analogy Aristides employs Pindar's words to show that the feeble excuse of the sophists instead of bringing them glory and good reputation, proved to be fallacious.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 182

We cannot decide upon the type of the poem to which this fragment belongs. There is no evidence that Pindar composed an epinician ode in which he treated for a second time the myth of Eriphyle, other than *Nem.* IX.6-30. The lines survived thanks to Aristides' proneness to illustrate his point with references to myths told by Pindar; the majority of them are quoted in paraphrase and exceptionally here *fr.* 182 has the form of a verbatim quotation. The words have the true Pindaric ring (cf. *Pyth.* VIII.95-6), and their authorship is stated explicitly by Aristides himself, but he does not say from which book they come. Aristides says only that Pindar wrote these lines καὶ πάλιν ὁρμηθεὶς ἐκ τῶν περὶ τῆς Ἐριφύλης λόγων.

The way that Aristides' statement is phrased suggests that he knew a particular variation of the myth of Amphiaraus and Eriphyle (: sister of Adrastus, daughter of Talaos, whose sons gave her as wife to Amphiaraus whose death she caused), as had been treated by Pindar.¹⁸ In identifying the authority he might have employed, we have to consider the following possibilities:

1. Aristides in an earlier study of Pindar, might have culled a considerable number of myths that Pindar treated in his poetry, as we can judge from the number of references and mythical connections he made to them in his speeches (e.g. Coronis, Heracles, Eurytion, Apollo-Rhodes, Nereus, Pan *etc.*). Therefore, it seems probable that extracts from myths containing Pindar's words, were classified and epitomised by Aristides under the name of the mythic person concerned. Many of them were paraphrased by him during his

¹⁸ The genitive plural [Ἐριφύλης] λόγων indicates that Aristides might know the passage in *Nem.* IX.16 ἀνδροδάμαντ' Ἐριφύλαν, which is the only extant testimony for the treatment of Amphiaraus-Eriphyle myth by Pindar.

study under a grammaticus. It is interesting here to note Aristides' tendency to quote from the text of paraphrase rather than from a Pindaric papyrus roll.

2. We possess a great number of papyrus fragments dating to the first and second centuries AD, containing compilations of myths.¹⁹ These texts were intended for school use in the second stage of education and in the schools of rhetoric.²⁰ The excerpted myths were listed under various categories or under the name of the main mythic figure (περὶ Ἡρακλέους, περὶ Θησέως *etc.*). It is probable –as I have suggested in the Introduction 6.4– that Aristides has made use of such material. If this is the case, the statement περὶ τῆς Ἐριφύλης λόγων must preserve the name of the *lemma* under which Aristides read these lines and copied them into his speech. The interpolation of the third singular verb φησὶν breaking the quotation into two parts, indicates accuracy in citing.²¹

Composing now this oration, he might have refreshed his memory with Pindar's words by consulting either his notes or a mythological handbook.

3. We should not rule out the possibility that there was a poem where the myth of Eriphyle was a kind of digression in narrative followed by *fr.* 182, whereas *fr.* 226 preceded the mythic section. According to that possibility both fragments might come from the same poem. The introductory phrase καὶ πάλιν ὀρμηθεὶς does not necessarily indicate that this comes from a different poem of Pindar.

¹⁹. The extant number of mythological texts shows the importance they had for educational purposes. In these texts are recorded the pedigree of the mythical figure as well as quotations and references to poetic treatments of the myth. For various papyrological testimonies see the discussion of 'Mythological compendia' in Introduction 6.4, as possible sources employed by Aristides.

²⁰. For the importance of paraphrase for educational practice see **Ibrachim** 1972: 26, 97ff.

²¹. Aristides' accuracy in citing *fr.* 182, is also supported from the fact that the following quotation from *Pyth.* III.83 keeps close to the original text.

III.2.1 Aristid. 34(50), 2, 239, 7K = Pind. *Pyth.* III. 83.

Aristides' context

In derogatory language Aristides speaks of the corrupted orators as people who avoid saying the truth, and apply euphemisms to their badness and misfortunes (§7). He dwells on an analogy between the corrupted orators and low-quality actors (ὑποκριταί), who advance arguments similar to those propounded by sophists. Being unable to conclude the play, they were thrown out of the stage and this was done in the course of gratifying the spectators.

XXXIV. (50) ΚΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΕΞΟΡΧΟΥΜΕΝΩΝ.

- 7 ἀλλὰ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων ὑποκοριζομένων τὴν αὐτῶν | 20
 φαυλότητα καὶ δυστυχίαν, οἱ τὸ μὲν δίκαιον, οἶμαι, καὶ ἀληθὲς | οὐκ ἐθέλουσι
 λέγειν, ὅτι τὴν ὀρθὴν οὐτ' ἴσασιν οὔτε δύνανται | πορεύεσθαι, φασὶ δὲ τοῖς
 ἀκροαταῖς χαριζόμενοι ταῦτα ποιεῖν, | ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν οἱ
 ἐκπίπτοντες καὶ μὴ δυνάμενοι τὸ | δρᾶμα περαίνειν κατὰ φύσιν τοῖς θεαταῖς 25
 φάσκοιεν χαριζόμενοι | ταῦτα ποιεῖν, καὶ συρίττεσθαι γε καὶ κλώζεσθαι ὑπ' 1
 αὐτῶν τῶν | θεατῶν ἀντὶ ταύτης τῆς χάριτος. φαίη τις ἂν· 'οὐκοῦν καὶ
 8 ὑμεῖς | ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκροατῶν'; ἀλλὰ μή πω ταῦτα. ἀλλὰ τί κωλύει καὶ | τοὺς
 πτωχοὺς τοὺς τὰ ῥάκια ἀμπεχομένους οἴκοι μὲν αὐτοῖς ἕτερα | εἶναι φάσκειν 5
 πάνυ γενναῖα ἱμάτια, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἔξω σχηματίζεσθαι; οὐκ οὐν ὁ γ' αὐτὸς
 ποιητὴς, οὗ μικρῶ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθην | (p. 288,8 sqq.), ἔφη τὰ καλὰ τρέπειν
 9 ἔξω τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς; ὥστ' εἰ μὲν | ὥς περὶ καλλιόνων τῶν λόγων
 διαλέγονται, τί δεῖ τοῖς πολλοῖς | ἐγκαλεῖν, εἰ τούτων ἐρῶσιν; εἰ δ'
 ὁμολογοῦσιν ἡμαρτηθῆναι, τού|ναντίον ἢ προσῆκαι πράττουσιν. πολὺ γὰρ 10
 μᾶλλον εἰκὸς ἦν αὐτοὺς | ὅπως τι βέλτιον ἐροῦσι σκέψασθαι τῶν
 ἀκουσομένων καὶ συνεσο|μένων εἵνεκα ἢ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἀγαθὰ ἀφανίζοντας
 τὰ χεῖρω δει|κνύναι, καὶ ταῦτα ἐξεπίτηδες ποριζομένους.

(Aristid. 34 (50) 2,238-9,7 K).

Immediately a crescendo begins within an accumulation of successive rhetorical questions, which advance the narrative and create a climax (§8). Aristides ingeniously reintroduces Pindar's poetry on a new analogy drawn between sophists and beggars, who being clad in rags, claim that they assume this appearance only before strangers, whereas they have at home other valuables clothes. Aristides sees a specific similarity and

correspondence in the attitude of beggars (πτωχοί) and that of the sophists, who analogously claim that they can produce quality oratory, but they choose to abandon it for gratifying their audience. Aristides in a deprecating tone questions the rectitude of the beggars' reasoning, and assumes that Pindar in his poetry suggested what Aristides considers to be the advisable practice.

The quotation comes from the third *Pythian ode*, from where he quotes *l.83* in a different word order and changing the syntax into *έτεροπροσωπία* (two-subject structure). The quotation is introduced in the form of direct question, and like the preceding quotes from Pindar, is proverbial in effect:

<i>Pythian</i> III.83	Aristid. 34(50), 2,239,7 K
ἀλλ' ἀγαθοί, τὰ καλὰ τρέψαντες ἔξω.	τὰ καλὰ τρέπειν ἔξω τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς;

Before looking at Aristides' subsequent words which treat in a detailed fashion the lines quoted from Pindar, it is better to focus on the quotation itself for a while.

Pindar *Pyth.* III.83

Pindar in a gnomic text,²² begins Hieron's encomium, by appealing to his sagacity. Hieron is assumed or at least invited by the poet,²³ to discern the preponderance of bad over the good in human life:

PYTHIA III (474?)
 εἰ δὲ λόγων συνέμεν κορυφάν, 'Ιέρων, 80
 ὀρθάν ἐπίστα, μανθάνων οἶσθα προτέρων
 ἐν παρ' ἑσλὸν πῆματα σύνδου δαίονται βροτοῖς
 ἄθᾶνατοι. τὰ μὲν ὦν
 οὐ δύνανται νήπιοι κόσμῳ φέρειν,
 ἀλλ' ἀγαθοί, τὰ καλὰ τρέψαντες ἔξω.
 (*Pyth.* III.80-3).

Such a knowledge is attributed by Pindar to an *old gnome* and specifically to *Il.* 24.527-30.²⁴ The scholiast *ad loc.* and the majority of modern critics,²⁵ imply that *Pyth.*

²² The gnomic character of the ode has already been suggested by **Barkhuisen** 1970: 137ff., who argues on the connection of the four gnomes in the section 8-80, *e.g.* *Il.* 11-2, 20-3, 54, and 59-60.

²³ **Young** 1968: 50 with n.4.

²⁴ *Il.* 24.527-30 δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακείται ἐν Διὸς οὐδὲ δώρων οἷα διδῶσι, κακῶν, ἕτερος δὲ ἑάων... ἄλλοτε μὲν τε κακῶ ὅ γε κύρεται, ἄλλοτε δ' ἑσθλῶ. The realistic character of this attitude without any pessimistic implications is rightly argued by **Young** 1968: 51.

²⁵ **Macleod** 1989: *ad loc.*, **Young** 1968: 51. For an interpretation of the Homeric lines see **Greene** 1944: 27. Plato (*Rep.* 379d) and Plutarch (*Mor.* 24A) rightly understood that there were only two jars.

III.80-2 indeed refers to this passage; but in fact Pindar does not mention jars at all and his basic idea, that the mortals receive from the god twice as much bad as good and so get a preponderance of evil, is just what Homer said.

Pindar elaborating the old gnome, remarks in a metaphorical fashion²⁶ that “*the evils foolish people (νήπιοι) cannot bear decorously, but the ἄγαθοί can bear them, by turning the fair parts outside*”. The scholia on *Pyth.* III.149 assume that the metaphor refers to the practice of turning the best parts of a garment to the outside so that they alone are visible.

The whole argument is based on the polar antithesis between νήπιοι and ἄγαθοί. Pindar addresses these lines to Hieron having in mind his recent illness, and according to his reasoning Hieron is admonished to follow the practice of ἄγαθοί. He has reached the summit of human expectations (*ll.* 84-8),²⁷ and consequently has many of τὰ καλὰ to “*turn to the outside*”, much good to utilise to the fullest (*cf.* *l.*62).²⁸ No man however, great and blessed by his allotment of happiness, goes without misfortune. Hieron is advised tacitly to bear the bad, making the best of whatever good he possesses.

Aristides agrees with the lyric poet and quotes his gnome to remind his audience of what Pindar assumed to be the best practice in case of “shortage” and “insufficiency”.

The words in Pindar are employed as we have already discussed, in a metaphorical sense, which is also preserved in Aristides' text. The gnome in Aristides has the effect of a crescendo because of its generalising and affirmative aspects. So the gnome, summarising the preceding narrative details, provides closure to this section of Aristides' *argumentatio*, and also intensifies his criticism against his opponents. The sophists are invited indirectly to follow the example of ἄγαθοί. Aristides' intention here

The preponderance of evil over the good in human life is the point of the passage (Greene 232ff.). The humans either get a mixture or receive only from one jar.

²⁶ **Gentili** (1995: *ad loc.*), argues for the metaphorical value of this proverbial locution. The same idea is developed in *fr.* 42, on that see **Burton** 1962: 87.

²⁷ He even surpassed Peleus and Cadmus, who serve as examples of human bliss; they also function as support for Pindar's reasoning (*ll.* 81-6).

²⁸ **Young** 1968: 52 with n.1, argues that this idea occurs frequently elsewhere in the poem, *cf.* *ll.* 35, 55, 61-2.

is to point out that the argument of πτωχοί, which according to him is also advanced by the corrupt orators is wrong, since it stands in opposition to Pindar's reasoning.

This interpretation is clearer from Aristides' statement in the next paragraph (9), where in Pindaric fashion he argues that it would be more reasonable for these orators to “turn outside” their good qualities instead of concealing them and display inferior ones on the feeble excuse of the audience's gratification. Aristides changes the meaning of Pindar's words. His argument is to discredit the argument provided by the rhetors, who should follow Pindar's advice. Aristides might know the line from *Pyth.* III and applies it to the sophists in a context different from that which Pindar intended by the phrase. Pindar did not endeavour to attack corrupt orators. Furthermore, Aristides speaking in a similar terminology (: clothing, dressing), bases the above correspondence on the common belief that everyone who joins a procession is dressed in the best possible style.

The source for Pind. *Pyth.* III.83

Affinities in vocabulary between the gnome and the corresponding scholia on *Pyth.* III.83, indicate the possibility that Aristides drew on the tradition of the commentators in the construction of the paragraphs (8 and 9), where he quotes Pindar's words.

149. ἀλλ' ἀγαθοί: τὴν μεταφορὰν εἰληφεν, οἷον ἂν τις νοήσειεν, ἐπὶ τῶν ἱματίων. ὅταν γὰρ ἔχη κηλίδας, οὐ δυνάμενός τις εὐκόσμως χρῆσθαι, τὸ μὲν κηλιδωθὲν ἔνδον ἔστρεψε, τὸ δὲ καλὸν ἔξω· τούναντίον δὲ ἔαν ἄφρων ᾦ, τὰς κηλίδας ἔξω ἔῃ. καὶ τὸν βίον οὖν τῶν ἀνθρώπων φησὶ κοινῇ μὲν πάντων 20 ἔχειν πῆματα, ταῦτα δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἄφρονας ἐν φανερώῳ παρέχειν, τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας μετὰ κόσμου φέρειν ἀποκρυπτομένους καὶ τὰ καλὰ τοῦ βίου ἔξω τρέποντας. 150^b B BDEGQ

(schol. *Pyth.* III.149 Dind.)

From the similarity between Aristides' text and the scholia, it becomes clear that Aristides was familiar with the tradition of the commentators and adopted their explanation extensively in his interpretation of Pindar's passage to such an extent that we can assume that his whole argument reflects the tradition found in the corresponding Pindaric scholia on l.83.

It is noteworthy that Aristides had quoted another verse (l.43) from the same *Pythian ode*, thirteen years before in his *Or. XVII* illustrating the last stage that Smyrna underwent in reaching its modern state.²⁹ As I argued in the discussion of the quotation (*Pyth.* III.43), it was possible that Aristides made use of the ancient commentaries in adopting their correction to Pindar's text *ad loc.*

Aristides quoted two extracts from *Pythian* III in his speeches, and for both quotations he seems to have used a commentary whose origins went back to the Hellenistic period.³⁰ The fact that he used an ancient commentary for both quotes, is indicative that *Pythian* III was included in the contemporary school curriculum and presumably was studied and commented under the *grammaticus* Alexander.

²⁹. Cf. the discussion of *Pyth.* III.43 on p.176ff.

³⁰. In *Or. XXVII* accepts explicitly a variant propounded by Aristarchus.

III.2.1 Aristid. 34(50), 2, 243, 18K = Pind. *Ol.* I. 30ff., 44.

The three quotations from *Olympian One* preserved in *Ors.* XVII.3 and XXI.10, are sufficient to show that Aristides knew the Pelops story as it is presented in *Ol.* I.25-7 and 48-51. Famed in antiquity and declared by Lucian to be “just about the most beautiful of all his poems” (*Gall.*7), it is very likely to have been known to Aristides. Confirmation comes from *Or.* XXXIV.25 *Κατὰ τῶν ἐξορχουμένων*, where Aristides makes use of more mythological material that Pindar treated in *Ol.* I, in the section after the story of Tantalus.

Aristides' context

In the present speech (XXXIV), Aristides in his vicious attack on sophists who flattered the masses, tries to define the intention of the true orator as being “to persuade men and frankly to get them under his control”.³¹ In §§19-37 he argues that the best style will prove most effective. In particular, it is vitally important for the art of oratory to combine *beauty* and *charm* to be more persuasive to the audience (§§25-6).³² The point is illustrated with further subtle references to Pindar:

XXXIV. (50) ΚΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΕΞΟΡΧΟΥΜΕΝΩΝ.

25 Ἐπεὶ τοι καὶ τὰ τῶν σωμάτων | 13
 κάλλη τούτων ἔχει τὸν τρόπον, ἐάν τε Γανυμήδην εἴπῃς ἐάν τε | Πέλοπα
 ἐάν θ' ὄντινοῦν, ἅμα τῇ λήξει τῆς τύχης καὶ τοὺς ὀρῶν|τας ἐφέλκεται· καὶ
 πάνυ γ' εἰκότως. δεῖ γάρ, οἶμαι, κάλλει μὲν | χάριν εἶναι, χάριτος δὲ ἔρωτα 15
 ἐξηρτῆσθαι. ὅτῳ γὰρ ἂν τις χαίρῃ, | τοῦτ' ἀνάγκη ποθεῖν. διὸ τῶν μὲν
 αἰσchrῶν οὐ φασιν ἔρωτα εἶναι, | τῶν δὲ καλῶν κὰν θεοῖς εἶναι ποιηταὶ
 26 λέγουσιν. οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ | τὸ τῶν λόγων κάλλος μετὰ τῆς ἀπάσης
 φύσεως καὶ τοῦτ' ἔχει, | κηλεῖν τοὺς ἀκούοντας. ὥστ' οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πείθην 20
 τὰ χεῖρω δεῖ | λέγειν, ἀλλὰ πειρατέον ὥς κάλλιστα λέγειν, ἵν' ὥς πλείστους
 ἄγωμεν. ὥσπερ γὰρ τῶν ἐπρωδῶν αἱ κράτισται μάλιστα ἄγειν |
 [πεφύκασιν], οὕτως οἱ κράτιστοι τῶν λόγων μάλιστα πείθην πε|φύκασιν.

(*Aristid.* 34 (50) 2,243,17-8 K).

³¹. For the real orator's way of handling the masses cf. *Or.* II.178-202.

³². In §§23-4, Aristides considering the great pleasure provided by the qualities that the victors displayed in crown contests and by the horses in finishing their run, he concludes that there is an identity between the best and the most pleasant. This principle also applies to physical beauty.

Aristides at §25 of his speech discusses the application of the principle that “*beauty must have its charm, and from this charm must love depend*” to the art of oratory.

Aristides' specific mention of Pelops and Ganymedes suggests that he knew Pindar's version.³³

Pindar *Ol. I*

The “true” story (which may have been Pindar's invention)³⁴ is that Pelops had the love of Poseidon, and was taken by Poseidon (as Ganymedes was at another time by the eagle of Zeus³⁵ or Zeus himself) when Tantalus called the gods to an ἔρανος.³⁶

***OLYMPIA I* (476)**

τότ' Ἀγλαοτρίαιναν ἀρπάσαι,	40
— δαμέντα φρένας ἱμέρω, χρυσέαισί τ' ἄν' ἵπποις	
ὑπατον εὐρυτίμου ποτὶ δῶμα Διὸς μεταβᾶσαι	
³ ἐνθα δευτέρω χρόνῳ	
ἦλθε καὶ Γανυμήδης	
Ζηνὶ τωῦτ' ἐπὶ χρέος.	45

(*Ol. I.40-5*).

Although there is ample evidence for an erotic relationship between Zeus and Ganymedes,³⁷ the reference to Pelops and Ganymedes together seems to be Pindar's invention for achieving the following:

- a. to draw an analogy between both figures.
- b. to indirectly praise Pelops through the comparison with Ganymedes,³⁸ and
- c. to add the Ganymedes myth as a familiar parallel from Homer³⁹ in order to reinforce the credibility of his version.

These two figures are associated in Aristides' text with the natural beauty and charm, which inspires love. Beauty alone is insufficient without enchantment. Aristides refers explicitly to the element of χάρις by which the two figures are drawn together in

³³. For a metaphorical use of the myth of Pelops and Ganymedes in later oratory see Lib. *Ep.* 441. 7.7, D.H. *Rh.* 6, 5, 17. Cf. also Clem. Romanus *Homily* 5.15.2 (Sp.); Pseudo-Lucian. *Charid.* 7.5.

³⁴. On Poseidon's role in the ode, see Köhnken 1974: 199-206. Köhnken thinks that Pindar invented his role in *Ol. I*. Mention of the well-known story of Zeus' abduction of Ganymedes provides credibility and a parallel for Pindar's probably invented story of Poseidon's abduction of Pelops.

³⁵. Cf. schol. *Ol. I.70g*.

³⁶. Pelops' disappearance caused jealous gossip and gave rise to an ungenerous hypothesis (*Il.* 46-51).

³⁷. Cf. the instances quoted by Gerber 1982: on 43, 45.

³⁸. Gerber (1982: 79), rightly observes “Pelops obviously wins more honour from having preceded than from having followed Ganymedes”.

³⁹. *Il.* 5.265-6, 20.231-2; *h. Ven.* 200-8; *Il. Parv.* fr.6 Allen.

Pindar's text; the charming appearance of Pelops and Ganymedes in *Ol. I* arouses the divine love. The suggested paederastic relationship in Pindar's text is perhaps hinted at by Aristides' wording σωμάτων κάλλη.⁴⁰ The sentence τοὺς ὀρῶντας ἐφέλκεται is used in a distinct homosexual context. Pederastic relationships were a normal and accepted part of Greek life, so for Aristides to refer to a story in which gods fell in love with mortals would not have shocked anyone. Pelops' ivory shoulder represents the object of Poseidon's ἕμερος.

In the ensuing lines, Aristides agrees with the Platonic view that “*there is no love of the shameful*” (*Smp.* 201a);⁴¹ Further testimony comes from the poetry, which functions as a sort of proof to his argument.⁴²

Aristides' sentence τῶν δὲ καλῶν κὰν θεοῖς εἶναι ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν seems to reflect ideas and vocabulary that Pindar treated in illustrating the erotic relationships of Pelops with Poseidon (*ll.* 25-6), and Ganymedes with Zeus (*ll.* 40-5).⁴³

The idea that “*the gods also love the beautiful*” is presented as a view shared by various poets in general. Aristides avoids on purpose identifying his exact source. The same technique is also followed in *Ors.* XVII and XXI, when other sections of the Pelops – Tantalus myth are given in paraphrase claiming vague authority.⁴⁴ The introductory phrase ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν suggests the existence of a direct poetic quotation phrased in Aristides' usual manner when sections of Pindaric myths are given in paraphrase and without attribution to Pindar.⁴⁵

In the section (*ll.* 28-9), Pindar explains how it is that people have come to believe in the traditional version of the Pelops myth to which he objects.

⁴⁰ In Pindar the relationships between Poseidon and Pelops and Zeus with Ganymedes are obvious from ἐράσσατο (25), δαμέντα... ἡμέρω (41), φίλια δῶρα Κυπρίας (75), and euphemistically in ἐπὶ χρέος (45); see Dover 1974: 214 on the use of euphemism to describe homosexual relationship. Ἀρπάσαι is regularly used of abduction for sexual purposes, cf. *h. Dem.* 3, *Pyth.* IX.6.

⁴¹ *Smp.* 201a.3-6: οἶμαι γὰρ σε οὕτωςί πως εἰπεῖν, ὅτι τοῖς θεοῖς κατεσκευάσθη τὰ πράγματα δι' ἔρωτα καλῶν· αἰσχροῶν γὰρ οὐκ εἴη ἔρωτος. οὐχ οὕτωςί πως ἔλεγε;

⁴² Cf. the deductive οὕτως, immediately after.

⁴³ Lucian in *Deor. Dial.* 4, in his hilarious characterisation of Ganymedes gives a similar account of Zeus and his καλός Ganymedes. Cf. *Smp.* 197b8 ὁ θεὸς οὗτος ἔφυ, ἐκ τοῦ ἐρᾶν τῶν καλῶν.

⁴⁴ Cf. the discussion on p.158.

⁴⁵ See introduction p.41.

ἢ θαύματα πολλά, καὶ πού τι καὶ βροτῶν
 φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον
 δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις
 ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι·
 (Ol. I.28-9).

28b

This section of the poem is a gnomic passage about the power of cleverly told stories to deceive people and misinterpret the truth. Pindar's sentence has a rhetorical function which enables Pindar to introduce his new version of the Pelops myth.

There is φάτις (tales: 'the common gossip of the people') beyond the true story. Because the previous tale about Pelops was told in a deceitful language, men believed it.

—
 Β' Χάρις δ', ἅπερ ἅπαντα τεύχει τὰ μείλιχα θνατοῖς,
 ἐπιφέρειοσα τιμὰν καὶ ἄπιστον ἐμήσατο πιστόν
 ἔμμεναι τὸ πολλάκις·
 ἀμέραι δ' ἐπίλοιποι
 μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι.
 (Ol. I.30-4).

31

Pindar wants to reject the story that deceives people (ψεύδουσιν), but his own story which is hard to believe (ἄπιστον) becomes πιστόν through χάρις, the elegance of his poetry, which will make his version acceptable for the world. His version will win belief because of the power of Charis.⁴⁶ However the future will tell which version will prevail. Χάρις refers to his own story.⁴⁷

Pindaric data are cleverly exploited. In §26 (οὕτω τοίνυν καὶ τὸ τῶν λόγων κάλλος) Aristides makes an analogy between Pindar's (ἄπιστον) version of the myth and the art of oratory. The connective link is the contribution of χάρις which in both contexts is presented as essential. It is a sort of prerequisite / precondition for success.

⁴⁶. Χάρις is one of Pindar's favourite words. For Pindar the word is often connected with his view of poetry. In this context it denotes the charm and beauty of poetry, in contrast with σοφία, which indicates the technical skill of the poet.

⁴⁷. Lines 30-1 are often interpreted as false tales which win belief because of the seductive charm of poetry. It is wrong to argue that χάρις refers to false and discreditable tale of Pelops' dismemberment. Pindar needs here to explain how his new version will become credible. The scholia get it more or less right. On Charis as "the charm which issues from poetry", see Verdenius 1987: 104-5. For arguments in support of the opposite view see Gerber 1982: on Χάρις (30); Duchemin 1955: 54-94 and recently Instone 1996: 101-2.

Instone instancing *Od.* 18. 282-3 rightly observes that “both good oratory and good poetry were traditionally regarded as having a seductive power to charm”;⁴⁸ Penelope beguiled the suitors with sweet words.

⁴⁸. *Ibid.* 102.

III. 3 QUOTATIONS: COMPARISON IN TERMS OF 'CONCORD' AND 'BEAUTY'

III.3.1 Aristid. 25(43), 2, 80, 12-4K = Pind. Ol. VII. 49-68.

Introduction to *Or. XXV* (43) *ΡΟΔΙΑΚΟΣ*

In early AD 142 during Aristides' stay in Egypt (cf. *Or. XXIV.3*), a great earthquake took place and ravaged Lycia, Caria, Cos, and Rhodes (cf. Paus. 8.43.4). Evidence for the date of the earthquake to AD 142 comes from the Opramoas inscription *IGRR III 739*.¹ The inscription consists of various documents where the earthquake is mentioned eight times in chapters: 40, 42, 46, 47, 53, 55, 59, and 63. These documents – concerning the earthquake – can be dated to September – November of AD 143, or to a later date.² What is more important, none are earlier, and in the documents drawn up in AD 142 or before there is no mention of such a disaster.

Aristides in AD 141 set out on a tour to Egypt. In the course of his trip, he stopped and declaimed at Cos, Cnidus, Rhodes, and Alexandria with varying success. He was still in Egypt when this disastrous earthquake destroyed the city of Rhodes. On this occasion Aristides composed a *speech of consolation*, which he delivered to the ambassadors who were sent from Rhodes to Alexandria for help and to the Alexandrians themselves.³ We have to note here that this oration is no longer preserved and is not to be confused with the present *oration XXV* Anonymi *Ῥοδιακός*.⁴

The present *Or. XXV* *Ῥοδιακός*, appears to have a similarity to *Or. XXIV* (*Ῥοδίσις περὶ ὁμονοίας*). From *Ῥοδιακός* §53 it is assumed that it was contemporary to the earthquake of Rhodes and was actually delivered in the ruined city.

¹. Cf. the discussion of the relevant evidences and data in Behr 1968a: 15 n.44, *id. Aristides* 1981: vol.II. 371 n.1.

². The earliest datable document of the inscription in which the disaster is mentioned, is ch. 40, Pius' rescript in answer to a decree (ch. 53), sent to him by the Lycian federation (dated by Behr to Gorpiaeus 7 = November 7, AD 143).

³. Evidence that Aristides had indeed delivered this speech come from *Or. XXIV.2-3* cf. πρὸς δὲ ὑμᾶς ὑπόλοιπον ἦν πέμψαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον συγγενέσθαι τὴν πρώτην. ... ὃν μὲν οὖν τρόπον διετέθη ἐπὶ τῇ περὶ τὸν σεισμόν συμφορᾷ καὶ ὁποῖόν τινα ἑμαυτὸν παρέσχον τοῖς πρεσβεύσασιν ὑμῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους, παρ' αὐτῶν κάλλιστ' ἂν πύθοισθε. We can assume here with Behr (1968a: 16 n.48), that the use of συγγενέσθαι τὴν πρώτην (*XXIV.1*) does not imply that Aristides did not make a speech at this time as Keil (1898: 72), has proposed. Behr suggests that Aristides conversed with the Rhodians by letter due to his illness.

⁴. Behr (1968a: 16 n.48), has also argued that *Or. XXIV* has no relation with the speech given at Alexandria. *Or. XXIV* deals with faction that occurred in Rhodes and it was a later composition.

The *corpus* of Aristides, like those of other famous writers, acquired apocryphal additions in later times.⁵ Three scholars, Keil⁶ followed by Boulanger⁷, and Behr⁸, considered *The Rhodian Oration* as spurious on the basis of the following criteria:

- i. the flaccid tone of the oration;
- ii. the loose style;
- iii. the preciousity in the use of words and constructions, and
- iv. the tasteless and revoltingly gruesome detail (cf. §27), could not be consistent with the stylistic manner of Aristides.

I treat this speech as genuine, first because the evidence against it is most inconclusive and the various attempts to argue against Aristides' authorship on mainly stylistic grounds are not entirely convincing (and in trying to point out inconsistencies in Aristides' account have reached conflicting results),⁹ and second: whoever is the author, the way that poetic quotations and in particular Pindar, is paraphrased and interpreted is the same as in the other speeches about Smyrna and Rhodes.

Aristides' context

After the proem, where the former greatness of the city is depicted (§§1-8), Aristides referring to the endurance that the Rhodians must show (§§11-6), describes over the next paragraphs (17-33), the immensity of the catastrophe caused by the earthquake.

XXV. (43) ΡΟΔΙΑΚΟΣ.

- 28 πυραὶ δ' ἀθήβεις ἐκαίοντο ὁμοίως νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, ταῖς πρόσθεν | ἱερομηνίαις 20
 ἀντίστροφοι· ἀντὶ δὲ χρυσείων καὶ ἀργυρείων μετάλλων | διώρυχος
 τοῦδαφος τῆς πόλεως παρεῖχε καὶ εἰς μῆνας ἐκκαθαίρειν | τοὺς κειμένους. καὶ
 πρότερον μὲν, ὦ Ζεῦ, τὰς φονικὰς δίκας ἔξω | πυλῶν ἐδικάζετε, ὡς οὐδὲ 1
 καταψηφίσασθαι θάνατον ἐντὸς τείχους | εὐσεβῶς ἔχον ὑμῖν, νυνὶ δὲ ἐπὶ μιᾷς
 ἡμέρας τοσούτων ὀλεθρον ὁ | δαίμων κατέγνω ἅμα τ' εἶσω πόλεως καὶ σὺν
 αὐτῇ, [καὶ τούτους | ἐν αὐτῇ κάειν ἠναγκάζεσθε οἱ λοιποὶ], καὶ τὴν ἄβατον
 29 τοῖς ἀνδροφόνοις πόλιν ταφὴν τῶν ἀπολλυμένων ἐκάστω κατέστησεν. καὶ 5
 τὰ | μὲν πρόσθεν λεγόμενα ταῦτα [μυθολογήματα] ἦν, ὅτι τήνδε τὴν | νῆσον
 οὖσαν ὑπὸ τῇ θαλάττῃ καὶ κεκρυμμένην Ἥλῳ δῶρον ἀνείψαν θεοί, τὰ δὲ
 νῦν εἰς τούναντίον περιέστηκε διηγῆσθαι, ὅτι ἤδε | ἡ πόλις κατὰ γῆς ἔδυ καὶ

⁵ There are other examples e.g. the disputed *Ors. Regarding the Emperor and Leptines*.

⁶ Keil 1898: 72, 91.

⁷ Boulanger 1923: 374 n.1.

⁸ Behr *Aristides* 1981: vol.II. 371 n.1.

⁹ *Ibid.* 371, Behr notes that 'this author looks with favour on "sophists", at §18, and differs from Aristides in the more conventional account of the numbers involved in the seizure of Phyle'.

ἀπῆλθεν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ὄντος ὑπὲρ γῆς | Ἥλιου, καὶ ἐπεῖδεν Ἥλιος ἐν Ῥόδῳ 10
 30 τὰ ἀθέατα θεάματα ἑαυτῷ. | καὶ Ὀμηρος (B 670) μὲν πλοῦτον ἔφη καταχέαι
 τὸν Δία τῇ νήσῳ | καὶ τοῖς περὶ Τληπόλεμον προγόνοις ὑμῶν, καὶ
 Πίνδαρος (O. VII 90) | παραλαβὼν ὕσαι χρυσὸν νεφέλην ξανθὴν
 ἐπιστήσαντα. νῦν δὲ | οἷα κατέχεε δῶρα ὁ δαίμων, οἷον νέφος ἔσπησεν
 ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, | ὥς ἀνάξια μὲν ἐκείνων τῶν πρότερον, ἀνάξια δὲ 15
 31 ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ τῆς | πόλεως σχήματος. καὶ νῦν Κάρπαθον μὲν καὶ Κάσον
 καὶ ἄλλας | νήσους οἰκουμένας ἔστιν ἰδεῖν, οὐδὲν ἐχούσας ὅ τι εἴπωσι καὶ παρ'
 | ὧν φόρον ἐκλέγειν ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ μικρὸν ἦν, καὶ ἄλλα πολίσματα |
 ὑπόψαμμα [λυπρὰ] καὶ ἀμφισβητήσιμα· Ῥόδος δὲ, ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ | πάντ' ἐφορῶν 20
 Ἥλιε πλὴν Ῥόδου, νῦν οὐδαμοῦ, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ οἱ | τοὺς μύθους λέγοντες
 διηγεῖσθαι δεῖ τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις τοὺς παρ' | ἡμῶν παραλαμβάνοντας, ὥς
 ποτὲ ἦν καὶ Ῥόδος ἀντιπέρας Καρίας | πόλις ὥρα καὶ μεγέθει περιφανής, καὶ
 τὸν τόπον δεικνύειν ὥς | τὸν Ἰαλύσου καὶ Καμείρου νῦν.

(Aristid. 25 (43) 2,79-80,12-14 K).

The gruesome details of the mangled bodies (cf. §27), give to the passage a grisly quality. Unaccustomed pyres burned unceasingly even in the sacred months, a time when fires were not lit. On this point Aristides is drawing on the tradition of Pindar who in the mythic section of the *Olympian* VII. refers at l. 48, to the establishment of fireless rites that the people of Rhodes offered to the goddess Athena on the hill of the citadel:¹⁰

OLYMPIA VII (464)

καὶ τοὶ γὰρ αἰθοίσας ἔχοντες 48
 σπέρμ' ἀνέβαν φλογὸς οὔ. τεῦξαν δ' ἀπύροις ἱεροῖς
 ἄλσος ἐν ἀκροπόλει.

(Ol. VII.48-9).

The annihilation to which the city of Rhodes was condemned by the δαίμων has overthrown the ordinary process of the things. Formerly the murder trials were held outside the gates since for religious reasons to pass a death sentence was forbidden within the walls (§28).¹¹

Over the next two paragraphs (29-30), the orator resorts to mythology from where he introduces *two myths* concerning the city of Rhodes:

¹⁰. We also have information from Philostratus the Elder, who quotes Pind. *Ol.* VII.48-50 in his *Imagines* 2,27,3, p.381, 27 Kayser (p.118,16 *Semin. Vindobon. Sod.*).

¹¹. Cf. D. Chr. XXXI, 122.

III.3.1 **First Myth:** *(the mythic creation of Rhodes): Ol.VII.54-5, 57, 67-8.*

The first myth concerns the mythical creation of the island: “*And the following myth was once told, that this island which lay hidden beneath the sea was raised by the gods as a gift to Helios*” The immediate literary pattern of this statement goes back to Pindar's poetry who in *Ol.VII* treats this theme at the second mythic section of the ode (*ll.* 55-68).¹² The orator introduces the myth in a Pindaric fashion giving only a paraphrase of the corresponding Pindaric text:

<i>Olympian VII.54-55, 57, 67-68</i>	<i>Aristid. 25(43), 2,80,5-8K</i>
<p>φαντί δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαί ρήσεις, οὕτω, φανερὰν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ, ἀλμυροῖς δ' ἐν βένθεσιν νᾶσον κεκρύφθαι. φαεννὸν ἐς αἰθέρα νιν πεμφθεῖσαν ἑᾶ κεφαλᾷ ἐξοπίσω γέρας ἔσσε- σθαι.</p>	<p>καὶ τὰ μὲν πρόσθεν λεγόμενα ταῦτα [μυθολογήματα] ἦν, ὅτι τήνδε τὴν νῆσον οὔσαν ὑπὸ τῇ θαλάττῃ καὶ κεκρυμμένην Ἡλίου δῶρον ἀνεῖσαν θεοί</p>

Whoever is the author, the way that Pindar is paraphrased, recalls that of the orations about Smyrna and Rhodes (cf. XXIV.50). Pindar here is quoted next to Homer according to Aristides' usual way.

In the splendid *Olympian Seven*, Pindar lists Diagoras' impressive achievements in various games and connects his personal ancestry with the mythical history of Rhodes in a way that makes this poem a celebration of the whole island.

Three myths about Rhodes fill the exact centre of the ode:

1. (*ll.* 20-33): The first myth concerns Tlepolemos who killed his great-uncle, but become founder of Rhodes.

2. (*ll.* 34-53): The second is an aetiological one about Heliadae, who forgot to use fire in their offering to Athena, but nevertheless receive great benefits through the golden rain of Zeus and the skills that Athena granted to them.

¹² The scholia on Pindar say that this story was not recorded before Pindar. Willcock 1995: *ad loc.* argues that it is likely enough that it was a local tradition.

3. (*Il.* 54-71): The third myth is about Helios who was absent from the allotment of the earth to the gods but became tutelary deity of Rhodes. From these myths only the second and the third are preserved in *Ῥοδιακός*, §29-30.

As many commentators have pointed out, there are progressions in the myths.¹³ Each tells of an act that seemed harmful at the time, but led to good in the end. They stand in reverse chronological order. Each is a story of origins, and as Kirkwood observes, they are told in ascending order of prestige for Rhodes. In the text of *Ῥοδιακός*, we can see that the way that the two of them are presented contributes to the creation of an anticlimax aiming to illustrate the contrast between former and the present state of the city.

The orator quotes firstly the third myth from *Ol.* VII, because he wants to make a parallelism of the fortune of the city when it was under the favour of the gods and the present state in which the city is depicted as “*sinking beneath the earth and has gone from mankind while the Sun was above the earth...*”. The purpose of this quotation is to illustrate the extent of the catastrophe caused by the earthquake.

The author shows great skill in contrasting Pindar's splendid image of Rhodes to the depressingly vivid description of the recent disaster.

III.3.1 Second Myth: a. *Il.* 2.670; b. *Ol.* VII.49-50: (Zeus' golden rain).

Aristides shows a certain familiarity with the relevant mythological narration concerning the city of Rhodes. So after the myth of creation, he mentions another mythic instance told by Homer in his famous ‘catalogue of ships’. The orator paraphrases accurately *Il.* 2.670 καί σφιν θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον κατέχευε Κρονίων. Homer in *Il.* 653-70, referring to the colonisation of Rhodes, presents the island as being favoured by Zeus. Rhodes is said to have been colonised at the time of the Dorian migration by Argive Dorians from Epidaurous, who were Herakleidai of the family of Tlepolemos, king of Argos and founder of three cities of Rhodes.¹⁴ This tradition is followed in *Ῥοδιακός*, §30, where “*Zeus ‘poured wealth’ upon the island and upon Tlepolemus*”.

¹³. Cf. the most recent treatments of Willcock 1995: 111ff.; Kirkwood 1982: 95.

¹⁴. The Dorian invasion was known to the Greeks as “the return of the children of Heracles”. See Willcock 1976: 31. There is a reference to a threefold tribal division which is a typical Dorian feature, at Rhodes in *Il.* 2.655 and 668.

The authorship of this quotation and of the following one, is clearly stated "Ὁμηρος μὲν... ἔφη and Πίνδαρος παραλαβών. The orator attempts to connect Pindar's version of the myth to that of Homer. Both quotes stand in chronological order and Pindar is introduced as building on the tradition of Homer (παραλαβών), giving his own version. This is the second story told by Pindar in *Ol.* VII.49-53, which is quoted in §30:

OLYMPIA VII (464)

ΚΕΙ-
 νοις ὁ μὲν ξανθὰν ἀγαγὼν νεφέλαν {Ζεὺς}
 ἔπολυν ὕσε χρυσόν· αὐτὰ δέ σφισιν ὥπασε τέχνην 50
 —πᾶσαν ἐπιχθονίων Γλαυκ-
 ὤπις ἀριστοπόνους χερσὶ κρατεῖν.
 (*Ol.* VII.49-51).

According to Pindar the Heliadae for their zealous piety in being the first to honour Athena, are rewarded by Zeus with a tawny cloud which produces a shower of gold.¹⁵ Athena for her part gave them extraordinary technical skill.¹⁶

The first part of this myth is explicitly quoted in the phrase ὕσαι χρυσὸν νεφέλην ξανθὴν ἐπιστήσαντα, which preserves the main words in a little variation:

1. The Pindaric phrase is changed into indirect speech, governed by παραλαβών, so that ὕσε is replaced by ὕσαι.
2. The ξανθὰν ἀγαγὼν νεφέλαν, becomes νεφέλην ξανθὴν ἐπιστήσαντα.

The author is interested in making a contrast between the wealth and the former riches that prevailed on the island and the present state of Rhodes. The riches and the divine favours that were bestowed on the city, were favourite themes in the mythological narrations, which now stand in sharp contrast to the present misfortune. The second part of the myth lies behind the paraphrase that follows the quotation. The phrase οἷα κατέχεε δῶρα ὁ δαίμων could well be a free paraphrase of Pindar's ὥπασε τέχνην. In a sarcastic style the orator comments: "*But now what sort of gifts did the δαίμων pour upon you, what sort of cloud did he stand over the city!*". The orator claims in a

¹⁵. Cf. Verdenius 1987: *ad loc.*; Duchemin 1955: 197. Cf. also schol. *Ol.* VII.89c εὖ κατὰ τὴν ἔμφασιν ὁ Πίνδαρος, φησιν, νεφέλην ὠνόμασε ξανθὰν, οἷον τὴν ἔγκυον χρυσοῦ· καθάπερ ὅταν ὕδωρ ἔχῃ ὁ ἀήρ, ζοφώδης ἐστίν.

¹⁶. According to Diodorus 5.55.2, the Rhodians were the first to make statues of the gods. Cf. also schol. *Ol.* VII.91a αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ Ἀθηναῖα κατὰ πᾶσαν χειρουργικὴν τέχνην τὸ ἀριστον αὐτοῖς ἀπένειμεν. b. ὕστερον δὲ οἱ Ῥόδιοι πολλὰ τῶν πρὸς τὸν βίον ἀνηκόντων ἐργαλείων εὗρον.

pessimistic tone that all the good fortune and the gifts have disappeared and in this respect all the praise about Rhodes is vain.

The source for *Olympian VII* in *Ors. XXIV* and *XXV*

The difficulty in deciding which was the source employed for these quotations from *Ol.VII*, is increased by the very fact that the *Or. XXV* *Ῥοδιακός* is classified as spurious. It is quite probable that certain references to and quotations of *Ol.VII* could have been also in the lost *consolatory oration* that Aristides delivered to Alexandrians and to Rhodian ambassadors sometime in AD 142 in Egypt. Someone therefore, could expect that Aristides considered as appropriate for such an occasion to make a specific mention of the special favours and of the gifts with which the island of Rhodes was honoured by the gods as a sort of encouragement in this extreme hour of disaster.

Olympian VII was popular in antiquity and was well known for commemorating the glories of the island. Given the popularity of *Ol. VII* it is indeed very likely that Aristides knew a complete text.

It is therefore reasonable to believe that he appreciated this Pindaric masterpiece which he employed later in this *consolatory speech*.¹⁷

Confirmation for the above hypothesis comes from *Or. XXIV* *Ῥοδίοις περὶ ὁμονοίας* where Aristides, at §50, explicitly refers to *Ol. VII*, preserving in paraphrase a part of the third myth in which – as we have already seen – Pindar dealt with the theme of the divine creation of the island. (Cf. also my discussion in *Ors. XXIV*, pp.269-70, and XXXIX, p.101).

¹⁷. According to the ancient tradition the Rhodians caused it to be engraved in letters of gold as a dedication in the temple of Athena at Lindos (cf. Graux 1881: 117). Aristides before his visit to Egypt stayed for some time at Rhodes. Here, he enjoyed inspecting the wonders of the city and he preserved vivid impressions of them. (Cf. *Ors. XXV*.2ff. and XXIV.53).

III.3.1 Aristid. 24(44), 2, 69, 4-6K = Pind. Ol. VII. 58, 62, 65, 68.

Aristides' context

The context in which Aristides quotes Pindar is quite different from that of *Or.* XXV. He advises the people of Rhodes to stay united and lead an harmonious life abstaining from faction, which is foreign to the city and hateful to the gods. At this point he introduces in paraphrase the third myth of *Ol.* VII.

XXIV. (44) ΡΟΔΙΟΙΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑΣ.

50 οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε τὸν Ἥλιον. | 1
 ὃς τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις θεατῆς ἐστὶ τῶν γιγνομένων, ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ | ἀρχηγέτης;
 οὐχ ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν ἡγήσεται | ταύτην πρώτην εἶναι
 τῇ νήσῳ τῆς γενέσεως, ὅτ' ἐκ τῆς θαλάττης | ἀνῆει δῶρον τῷ θεῷ; οὐχ 5
 ὅπως μὴ τῶν ἱεροσύλων φαυλότερος | φανεῖται λυμαίνόμενος τῷ
 κλήρῳ τοῦ θεοῦ φροντιεῖ; οὐ τὰς χεῖρας | ἄρας ἄνω σὺν αἰδοῖ καὶ δέει
 51 συγγνώμην αἰτήσῃ τῶν μέχρι τοῦδε | ἡμαρτημένων τοὺς θεούς; ἀλλ' ὥσπερ
 ἐν σκοτομαίνῃ φθείρεσθε | τὴν ἱερὰν τοῦ Ἥλιου πόλιν νεμόμενοι.

(*Aristid.* 24 (44) 2,69,4-6 K).

The rhetorical aim of Aristides is to create a sense of shame by referring to the favour that the god Helios bestowed on the island. Aristides illustrates his point with a reference to the literature and in particular to Pindar's *Ol.* VII. The role of his quotation is to point out the inconsistency between the former favours granted by Helios and the present ungrateful and factious attitude of the Rhodians. Given the popularity of *Olympian seven* it is indeed very likely that everyone knew it and therefore the attempted connection by Aristides would have been well understood.

The form that Aristides chooses to quote Pindar is again that of paraphrase, which now seems more detailed in comparison to that preserved in *Or.* XXV, because Aristides now writing seven years later,¹⁸ attempts a few new and more explicit connections between Rhodes and some aspects of the myth told by Pindar. These connections are not intended in *Or.* XXV. We can discern the following ones:

¹⁸. For the date of *Or.* XIV in September 149 AD, see Behr 1968a: 74 n.48a.

<i>Olympian VII.58, 62</i>	<i>Aristid. 24(44), 2,69,4-6K</i>
(l. 62): εἶπέ τιν' αὐτὸς ὁρᾶν <u>ἐνδον θαλάσσης</u> <u>αὐξομέναν</u> πεδόθεν (l. 68): γέρας ἔσσεσθαι. (l. 58): ἐνδειξεν <u>λάχος</u> 'Αελίου'. (l. 65): <u>χεῖρας ἀντεῖναι</u>	ὅτ' ἐκ τῆς θαλάττης ἀνήει δῶρον τῷ θεῷ; οὐχ ὅπως μὴ τῶν ἱεροσύλων φαυλότερος φανεῖται λυμαινόμενος τῷ κλήρῳ τοῦ θεοῦ φροντιεῖ; οὐ τὰς <u>χεῖρας ἄρας</u> ἄνω σὺν αἰδοῖ καὶ δέει συγγνώμην αἰτήσῃ τῶν μέχρι τοῦδε ἡμαρτημένων τοὺς θεούς;

It seems likely that Aristides made reference to the story told in *Ol. VII* in his lost speech, which is echoed again in *Or. XXV.29-30* as relevant to his argument.¹⁹ Thus, it seems likely that Aristides used a text of Pindar for the potential mythical references to the island of Rhodes, which through the art of *variatio* were repeated in a shorter or fuller version at *Ors. XXIV* and *XXV*.²⁰

I do not think that Aristides employed at this point an *anthology* or a mythological *compendium*, since he connects the two mythical narrations about Rhodes and his literary pattern for that is Pindar's *Ol. VII*.

The source for Pind. *Olympian VII* (*Ors. XXIV, XXV and XXXIX*)

Aristides exhibits a considerable familiarity with the mythic section of the ode. He quotes artfully and accurately in paraphrase and alludes to different parts from the *second* and *third* myth of the ode in his *Ors. XXIV* ('*Ροδίοις περὶ ὁμονοίας*) and *XXV* ('*Ροδιακός*).²¹

Olympian Seven is one of the Pindaric odes of which Aristides appears to have a more comprehensive knowledge. The number of his quotations of and allusions to the ode suggests the possibility that he may have studied this ode from a fuller text of Pindar. In *Or. XXXIX*, Aristides seems to have employed an ancient *ὑπόμνημα*, where in §16 he quotes the gloss αὐτόχυτον.

¹⁹ The similarity of *Or. XXV* to oration *XXIV* has also been propounded by Behr *Aristides* 1981: vol.II. 371 n.I.

²⁰ This seems that is the case for *Or. XXV*, since the paraphrase in *Or. XXIV* appears to be more independent and possibly this might come from the text of Pindar itself rather than an indirect source.

²¹ *I.e.* Zeus' golden rain (: *ll. 49-51*), and the mythic creation of Rhodes (: *ll. 54-5, 57, 67-8*).

The following table is indicative of Aristides' knowledge for *Ol.* VII:

<i>Il.</i>	Pind. <i>Olympian</i> VII.	Aristid. <i>Or.</i> XXIV; XXV; XXXIX	<i>Ors.</i>
7	νέκταρ <u>χυτόν</u> , Μοισᾶν δόσιν,	Πίνδαρος τὸ νέκταρ ἐποίησεν <u>αὐτόχυτον</u> , πότιμον θεία τινὶ κράσει κεκραμένον ἀρκούντως.	XXXIX. 16
49-51	κείνοις ὁ μὲν ξανθὰν ἀγαγὼν <u>νεφέλαν</u> (Ζεὺς) πολὺν ὕσε χρυσόν· αὐτὰ δὲ σφισιν ὥπασε τέχνην παῖσαν ἐπιχθονίων Γλαυκῶπις ἀριστοπόνους χερσὶ κρατεῖν.	καὶ Πίνδαρος παραλαβὼν ὕσαι χρυσὸν <u>νεφέλην ξανθὴν ἐπιστήσαντα</u> . νῦν δὲ οἷα <u>κατέχεε δῶρα</u> ὁ δαίμων, οἷον νέφος ἔστησεν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως,	XXV. 30
54-5 56-7 67-8	φαντὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων παλαιαὶ ῥήσιες, φανερὰν ἐν πελάγει Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ, ἀλμυροῖς δ' ἐν βένθεσιν νᾶσον κεκρύφθαι. φαεννὸν ἐς αἰθέρα νιν πεμφθεῖσαν ἑᾶ κεφαλᾷ ἐξοπίσω γέρας ἔσσεσθαι.	καὶ τὰ μὲν πρόσθεν λεγόμενα ταῦτα [μυθολογήματα] ἦν, ὅτι τήνδε τὴν νῆσον οὖσαν ὑπὸ τῇ θαλάττῃ καὶ κεκρυμμένην Ἡλίῳ δῶρον ἀνείσαν θεοί	XXV. 29
58 62 65 68	ἔνδειξεν λάχος Ἀελίου· εἶπέ τιν' αὐτὸς ὁρᾶν <u>ἐνδον θαλάσσης</u> αὐξομένην πεδόθεν <u>χεῖρας ἀντεῖναι</u> γέρας ἔσσεσθαι.	ὅτ' ἐκ τῆς θαλάττης ἀνήει δῶρον τῷ θεῷ; οὐχ ὅπως μὴ τῶν ἱεροσύλων φαυλότερος φανεῖται λυμαινόμενος τῷ κλήρῳ τοῦ θεοῦ φροντιεῖ; οὐ τὰς <u>χεῖρας ἄρας</u> ἄνω σὺν αἰδοῖ καὶ δέει συγγνώμην αἰτήσῃ τῶν μέχρι τοῦδε ἡμαρτημένων τοὺς θεούς;	XXIV. 50

From the above table we can see that Aristides employed *Ol.* VII in his *Ors.* XXIV and XXV, in making mythical references to the city of Rhodes. In these two speeches he contrasted the former grandeur and divine favour for the city with the present circumstances (*i.e.* *Or.* XXV: the disaster after the earthquake; *Or.* XXIV: the prevailing political factions). The orator employed for a third time the opening lines of this ode in his *Or.* XXXIX in giving a compliment to the sacred waters of Asclepius' well.

We should not here rule out the possibility that the three myths of *Ol.* VII were culled and paraphrased in a handbook of selected passages, which was probably intended for school practice. The paraphrase of selected texts from the classic authors was of fundamental importance in the Hellenistic and Roman times. We possess a great deal of papyri in which poetic passages were given in paraphrase. The surviving examples

suggest that these were compiled either by the teacher as an 'example'²² to be followed or by the students themselves.

²². Such an example is *PSI XIII/I* (1949), no.1303 (III AD), containing a paraphrase of a scene from Eur. *Phoen*. In the introduction of the papyrus there is a detailed analysis of the play and its characters. The paraphrase is given in iambic verses and its accuracy indicates that it was composed by a teacher.

III.3.2 Aristid. 23(42), 2, 41, 23K = Pind. *Pyth.* IX. 95?

Introduction to *Or.* XXIII (42) *ΠΕΡΙ ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑΣ ΤΑΙΣ ΠΟΛΕΣΙΝ*

The harmony between the cities of Asia was always a favourite theme for Aristides, and finds its fuller expression in the present oration. This idea was expressed four months before in *Or.* XXVII.

On January 3, AD 167, Aristides prompted by a dream from Asclepius,¹ travelled from his estates in Mysia to Pergamum where the provincial assembly (*Κοινόν* of Asia), would convene for the celebration of the *nuncupatio votorum*.² Aristides addressed the assembly with this oration, in which he tried to curb the rivalry of the leading cities of Asia over precedence, titles, and other empty symbols of rank.³ We know from Dio Chrysostom (XXXIV 48, 51); Cassius Dio (LII 37. 10); Philostratus (VS 539-40), that the emperor himself intervened to stop the dispute.⁴

Aristides proclaimed in his speech the unity of the Province; he praised the three chief cities, and illustrated with examples from history the advantages of concord and the disadvantages of faction.⁵

Aristides' context

In the section §§31-40, Aristides enumerates the disadvantages pertaining to dissension among the three metropolises of Asia, Smyrna, Pergamum, and Ephesus. He draws a parallel between these cities and generals who believe that they must maintain good order and discipline, whose infraction could lead to a disruptive faction.

Aristides resorts to poetry of Homer firstly, and of Pindar later, in order to illustrate what he considers as imperative for the cities which have the chief voice in the council to overcome their rivalries. He emphatically argues that the bestowal of praise – which is the subject of the poetry – from one city to the other is vital and practical. The two poets are connected by the orator with an aphoristic statement which structurally

¹. *Hieros Logos* I (47).59.

². For the circle of the meetings of the assembly, see Lucian *Pseudol.* 8, Plut. *Cic.* 2.1, *IGRR* IV 353 B-6, C-4, D-6, cf. Behr 1968a: 63 n.14, *id.* 1994: §9. On these assemblies, cf. Deininger 1965.

³. See generally Merkelbach 1978. Cf. also Behr 1968a: 104-5; Magie 1950: 1496, 1500-1.

⁴. Cf. *Or.* XXIII 73; *SIG*³ 849 = Abbott-Johnson 1926: no.100. The rivalry according to Behr (*Aristides* 1981: vol.II. 365 n.1), was symptomatic of the peace and security which Asia enjoyed at that time, cf. §§3, 53-4, 63.

⁵. Behr dates the speech in AD 167, on the grounds that the reported Parthian war is now over cf. §§3, 53-7, and that Marcus and Verus are emperors; however, Boulanger (1923: 162), suggests a date between AD 161-165.

functions as a transition from one to the other: “*gracious praise, they say, is easy to bear*”.

XXIII. (42) ΠΕΡΙ ΟΜΟΝΟΙΑΣ ΤΑΙΣ ΠΟΛΕΣΙΝ.

- 36 ἔξεστι δὲ καὶ τῶν Ὀμήρου μαθεῖν |
 ἐπειδὴ γὰρ κοινότατος ὁ ποιητὴς, οὐ χειρόν κάκινω πρὸς γε τὰ | τοιαῦτα 15
 προσχρῆσθαι. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ τοὺς τε ἥρωας ἅπαντας ὥς | ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἐπαινεῖ
 καὶ τοὺς ἐναντιωτάτους ἀλλήλοις, ἡγούμενος | μείζω τοῖς κρατήσασιν
 αὐτῶν οὕτως ἂν γίγνεσθαι τὴν δόξαν. καὶ | τὰς πόλεις καταλέγων ἄλλας
 ἄλλον κεκόσμηκε τρόπον, πάσας δ' εἰς | ὅσον οἶόν τε ἦν, ὃ τι καὶ μικρὸν ἔχοι 20
 τιμῆσαι τινὰ αὐτῶν οὐδαμῇ | προϊέμενος. ἐλαφρὰ γὰρ, φασί, χάρις ἢ τῆς
 εὐφημίας. ὥστε μηδὲ | τοὺς ἐχθροὺς δεῖν ἀποστερεῖν τοῦ τοιούτου
 χρηστοῦ γέ τι πράξαν|τας θεῶν τινος εἶναι παραίνεσιν Ἡρακλεῖ
 37 Πίνδαρος, οἶμαι, | λέγει. οὕτω φύσει θεῖόν τι τὸ χρῆμα τῆς εὐφημίας, καὶ
 οὐκ | ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἱερῶν μέλλωμεν κατάρχεσθαι, τότε ἔχει μόνον καιρόν, | 25
 ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ἀνθρωπείων πραγμάτων· τοὺς δ' εἰς | ὅσον
 ἔξεστι χρωμένους αὐτῇ κεχαρισμένως ἂν τοῖς θεοῖς ποιεῖν | σύμβολον ἢ τε
 τοῦ κήρυκος αὕτη φωνὴ καὶ ἢ τῶν ἱερέων, ἐπειδὴν | τάγαθὰ τοὺς θεοὺς
 38 αἰτῶμεν, γιγνομένη. ὥσθ' ὅτε τῇ τῶν ἀγαθῶν | αἰτήσῃ προσήκει τοῦτο τὸ 30
 εἶδος τῶν λόγων, εἰκὸς δὴ πού καὶ | καθάπαξ αὐτὸ τιμῶντας βέλτιον 1
 πράττειν ἂν οἶεσθαι καὶ τῆς βελ|τίονος μοίρας σῶζειν πράγμα· εἰ δ' αὖ τοῦθ'
 οὕτως ἔχει, πῶς οὐ | φευκτέον καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἡ στάσις;

(Aristid. 23 (42) 2,41-42,21-24 K).

Aristides sees precedents in Homer for his ideas about the theme of the allocation of praise to both individuals and cities. He presents him as the most common possession of the Asian cities making a pun on the word Κοινόν of Asia.⁶ Aristides thinks in more general terms of the way that Homer presents heroes and cities. Generally Homer is not biased against Trojan heroes, for example Hector and Sarpedon, who are presented as great heroes; (cf. his praise to Priam). He was equally impartial in his praise to every city without omitting even a small honour to them.

The subsequent statement ἐλαφρὰ γὰρ, φασί, χάρις ἢ τῆς εὐφημίας, functions – as we have already seen – as a bridge to Pindar's poetry.

⁶ The choice of the poet and the intended connection with the Κοινόν of Asia, is clear since Smyrna and other Asian cities claimed the prerogative of being his birthplace.

This assertion has a defensive tone and is proverbial in effect, functioning as an unquestioned statement (φασί).⁷ Pindar expressed similar ideas and often connects χάρις with his views on poetry.⁸ In Aristides' context the term denotes the *charm* and *beauty* that the praise (εὐφημία) must have, so that it can be pleasant to hear.⁹ The phrase suggests an indirect demand for “*measure*”. Aristides' statement may recall a similar view Pindar phrased in *Pyth.* IX.76-9 stating that great achievements give material for many songs, but what a discriminating audience responds best to is a poet's skilful treatment of a selection from the abundance.¹⁰ In all circumstances καίρως achieves the best results. However, unlike Pindar, Aristides makes a clear distinction between human and divine need for praise.

The point that Aristides makes on the bestowal of the praise in Homer, is now illustrated in more depth with a direct reference to Pindar's *Pyth.* IX.95-6. The conjunction ὥστε introduces the poet's words in paraphrase, which ends with Aristides' statement Πίνδαρος, οἶμαι, λέγει:

(36) “*Therefore Pindar, I think, remarks that a certain god advised Heracles that he should not even deprive his enemies of this [praise] when they have done something good*”.

The phrase οἶμαι, λέγει, is an Aristideian touch admitting in some way that the quote may not be exact carrying also the implication that the focus of the citator's attention falls on the substance of Pindar's gnome rather than its precise wording. In any case it does not indicate lack of punctiliousness in citing.

This is one of the characteristic turns of phrase that Aristides used in introducing quotations: *E.g.* *Or.* XXVIII. 51 οἶμαι δέ σε καὶ Σαπφοῦς ἀκηκοέναι, *Ib.* 65 οἶμαι, λέγει

⁷. Cf. Reisk *non Homerus, sed proverbium*, ἡ παροιμία. I did not succeed to trace the phrase in the transmitted paroemiographical corpus or elsewhere in literature.

⁸. Cf. *Isth.* III.8, *Ol.* VII.11. Also Gianotti 1975: 68-83; For the χάρις in Pindar see Verdenius 1987: 103-6; Richardson 1985: 383.

⁹. Aristides (*Or.* XXXIV.26), expressed similar ideas about the qualities that a rhetorical speech must have so that it can be more persuasive and pleasing to the audience.

¹⁰. Cf. Carey 1981: *ad loc.*; Kirkwood 1982: *ad loc.*

τὸ ἐπίγραμμα (Simon.).¹¹ This propensity is shared among an extensive number of authors in Imperial Age.¹²

Pindar *Pyth.* IX. 95

In the section (*Il.* 76-103) of *Pyth.* IX, Pindar after the myth of Cyrene, seizes upon the myth of Iolaus defending Heraclids. He quotes a gnome of the Old Man of the Sea (*l.*95):

PYTHIA IX
 οὔνεκεν, εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν, εἴ τις ἀντά-
 εις, τό γ' ἐν ξυνῷ πεποναμένον εὔ
 3 μὴ λόγον βλάπτων ἀλίοιο γέροντος κρυπτέω·
 κείνος αἰνεῖν καὶ τὸν ἐχθρόν
 παντὶ θυμῷ σύν τε δίκῃ καλὰ ῥέζοντ' ἔννεπεν. 95
 (*Pyth.* IX.93-6).

Pindar, whose poetry characteristically bestows praise (αἶνος) or blame (ψόγος), says that if a man has accomplished a worthwhile deed, such as victory, which is shared by the community (ἐν ξυνῷ)¹³, all men, friends and enemies alike, should praise him.¹⁴ The story to which Pindar alludes is not otherwise known. Pindar ascribes this advice to a figure of the sea. The combined references we have (*Il.* 18.141, *Od.* 4.384, and *Th.* 233-6), point to the sea-god *Nereus*.¹⁵ The sense of justice and moral earnestness of the Pindaric account recall Hesiod's description in *Th.* 234-6.¹⁶

This sense of benevolent justice is echoed in Aristides' paraphrase, where the gnome is attributed to a certain god.

¹¹. Cf. also *Or.* III.37 οἶμαι... φασὶ συμβῆναι (*Hdt.* I.35); *Or.* II.135 (*Hom.*).

¹². Cf. *Plut. de vit. pudore* p. 536C οἶμαι τὸ τοῦ Πινδάρου, *Id. de Pyth. or.* p.404D (*Heraclit.*); *Luc. Philops.* 24.31 (*Pl.*); *Str.* 12.3.20.

¹³. Cf. *Isth.* VI.69. *Xenoph. fr.* 2, doubted the contribution of athletics in advancing social prosperity. Cf. also **Angeli Bernardini** 1980.

¹⁴. The necessity of the bestowal of praise is a commonplace, see **Bundy** 1986: 55ff. Cf. a similar development in *Bacch.* 5.187ff. **Kirkwood** 1982: 230 (*Il.* 93-6), argues that this is a variation of the commoner theme that great achievements inevitably arouse φθόνος.

¹⁵. **Carey** (1981: *ad loc.*), argues for the preference of the archaic poets to quote famous men.

¹⁶. **Instone** (1996: *ad loc.*) suggests (cf. **Farnell** 1961: *ad loc.*), that Pindar may have employed a manual in which moral maxims were listed under the title "Sayings of the Old Man of the Sea". Farnell's assumption that Pindar's saying here derives from the lines in *Th.* 234-6 αὐτὰρ καλέουσι γέροντα, οὔνεκα νημερτὴς τε καὶ ἥπιος, οὐδὲ θεμιστέων λήθεται, ἀλλὰ δίκαια καὶ ἥπια δῆνεα οἶδεν, is weak since Hesiod with the expression καλέουσι γέροντα refers to the god's cultic appellation in Gytheion, cf. *Paus.* 3. 21, 9. More plausible seems Bloch's suggestion (in *Roscher, Lexicon*, iii. p.244, s.v. *Nereus*), "a quotation from some epic source".

According to Carey, Pindar in *Il.* 93-4 stresses apart from the need to honour Telesicrates, the need for the Thebans to recognise Pindar's own loyalty in praising his city.¹⁷ This serves Aristides for wider reflections. The quoted gnome from Pindar has a didactic value functioning for Aristides as a point of departure: the indisputable view that a noble achievement reflects credit on the society and deserves a just amount of praise, becomes a key-idea, which is common to both Aristides and Pindar.

As Telesicrates brings glory to his homeland and Pindar admonishes his fellow citizens to praise his achievements in accordance with the saying of Nereus, Aristides employs the gnome of the sea-god, and relates it to the rivalry of Asian cities, postulating that if the cities which have the chief voice in the council stop vying for pre-eminence and bestow praise on one another for their achievements to the common interest, this will terminate the discord.¹⁸

Aristides argues for the divine nature of praise (φύσει θεῖον), which is presented as pleasing to the gods.¹⁹ On those grounds he considers the praise as the vital means of overcoming the bickering (§38). He sees the slander as the opposite of praise.²⁰

The source for Pind. *Pyth.* IX. 95

What is problematic in Aristides' paraphrase is the presence of Heracles as recipient of gods' advice. Surprisingly, Heracles is not mentioned in Pindar. The existing

¹⁷ Carey 1981: *ad loc.*

¹⁸ Ephesus had received the right to call itself "*the first and greatest metropolis of Asia*" Smyrna, which did not then enjoy so exalted a distinction, in a decree concerning Ephesus omitted this title and the Ephesians wrote to Pius to complain. In his reply, Pius pointed out that Smyrna's conduct may have been inadvertent and in any case the situation would improve if in future Ephesus in their own communication gave Smyrna its proper title. The reference is to Pius' diplomatic letter to the Ephesians, see *SIG*³ 849 (better in *IK* XV [Ephesos V], 1489-90). Aristides further down in §73, reminds his audience of Pius' interest in good relations between the Asian cities expressed in this letter: "*he promised that he would judge those to be finest and best who voluntarily initiated the concord*". On the letter's style cf. Williams 1976: 75. Cf. also the imperial letter found at Laodicea urging an end to "vain contentiousness" over "primacy" and bidding them be "more dignified" (*MAMA* vi.6; Swain 1996: 224 n.143).

¹⁹ Cf. *Pyth.* X.34-6 where the word εὐφημία describes the emotional state of Apollo in a feast in Hyperboreans. The god is pleased with the banquet and the hymns. Cf. *Il.* 1.601ff. where the music and song are necessary for a happy life.

²⁰ Aristides spoke of special privileges granted to the province by the Government (§§11, 79), and he admonished the factious cities not to mar the triumph over Parthia and the charms of the *pax Romana* by their frivolous and vain squabbles. Cf. *Or.* XIV.30-1 for the same idea.

scholia on Pindar attribute the saying to the sea-god Nereus without giving any illustration of the connection of Heracles to the god:

164. ο ὕνεκεν, εἰ φίλος ἀστῶν: διὸ εἴτε τις αὐτῷ τῷ νικηφόρῳ
 φίλος τῶν πολιτῶν εἴτε ἐναντίος καὶ ἐχθρός ἐστι, τὸ ἐν τῷ κοινῷ πονηθὲν 10
 ἀγαθὸν ἀνυμνεῖτω, αὐτὸν μὴ καταβλάπτων τὸν λόγον τοῦ Νηρέως.
 ἐκεῖνος γὰρ, ὁ Νηρεὺς, ἔφη δεῖν τὸν καλῶς πράττοντα καὶ μετὰ δικαιοσύνης
 πάντα τρόπον καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀνυμνεῖσθαι. BDEGQ
 (schol.Pyth. IX.164 Drach.)

The existence of Heracles in Aristides' text has been treated variously:

1. The connection of Heracles to Nereus was Aristides' own invention. Since it was difficult for ancient authors to verify a verse in a papyrus roll, it was easier for them to quote it as they remembered. Probably Aristides made that connection in order to give more weight to Nereus' saying reported by Pindar. Furthermore, Behr argues that: "*the slip is probably Aristides*", referring to *Or.* II.95, where Aristides quoting *Od.* 4.160 among other extracts from Homer, misidentifies the speaker.²¹

2. Georg Kaibel in Keil's edition suggested that the existence of Heracles might have occurred in a fuller scholium to Pindar, which is now lost.

Aristides is almost certain to have read a considerable amount of scholia on Pindar. If the mythic connection (Hercules—Nereus) has its authorship in the tradition of the scholiasts, I can see two possibilities:

a. It is probable that his teacher Alexander, who lectured and wrote commentaries on, among others, Pindar, noticed the point. He may have made the connection between the two figures, or he drew on earlier scholia.

b. The Pindaric line was explained in Hellenistic commentaries, which might be liable for the mythic connection. The scholium was preserved at least until the time of Aristides. Post-Aristidean commentators disregarded it for unknown reasons, and since then it remained only in Aristides' Mss.

²¹. Behr *Aristides* 1981: vol.II. 367 n.33. Indeed, it was Telemachus and not Pisistratus. One can object to Behr's view that this quotation did not stand alone in the speech, but it was part of a group of sixteen quotes from *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In such an accumulation the confusion of the speaker can go unnoticed, since all are employed to prove that the glorious achievements of Demodocus and Alcinous derive from divine inspiration. In addition, when Aristides complains in *Or.* XXXVI.112, about a geographical error committed by Pindar (*fr.*201.1), he is correct. Cf. the discussion on the *fr.*201.

3. Heracles and Nereus are linked in the literary tradition, which names Nereus as the god with whom Heracles must wrestle for the needed assistance.²² In this connection, we must consider the possibility that Aristides found this connection in Apollodorus (*Bib.* 2.115), who follows Pherecydes in linking Nereus to the Hesperides Labor (here the Nymphai of the Eridanos send Heracles to Nereus to learn the location of the Garden: Pherec. 3F16aJ), and the cup of Helios.²³

If this is the case, then Aristides may have quarried this connection from various mythological *compendia* and aitiological *δηγήσεις*; like those the Alexandrian scholars had compiled and continued through the first and second centuries AD.

The apophthegmatic character of Nereus' saying suggests also the probability that it was quoted in a gnomologium containing ethical ῥήσεις presumably listed under the title: "sayings of wise men".

All these are pure speculations. Unfortunately, one can not be sure of Pindar's train of thoughts because Aristides may be quoting these lines which, out of context, can fit into his own interpretation as offered in §37, where he distinguishes between human and divine need for praise. However, it seems more probable to assume that Aristides quoted Nereus' gnome from a commentary on Pindar (Hellenistic, Alexander's), than that he went back to the poet's text itself.

²². As a sea god Nereus is (like Proteus in the *Odyssey*) endowed with special wisdom and prophecy, (Fränkel 1973:449).

²³. In Panyasis (Ath. 11.38.8) Heracles obtains the cup from Nereus in order to sail to Erytheia (fr.9 Bernabe).

III. 4 OTHER QUOTATIONS IN SUPPORT OF ARISTIDES' 'ARGUMENTATIO'

III.4.1 *Or. XXVIII. 'Περὶ τοῦ Παραφθέγματος'* (49)

Introduction to *Or. XXVIII 'CONCERNING A REMARK IN PASSING'*

When Aristides was still an incubant at the temple of Asclepius at Pergamum (AD 145-147), he delivered a speech to *Athena*.¹ Objections of an unnamed critic were provoked when Aristides in the course of this speech made some remarks in passing on its excellence. These literary feuds were not uncommon, and Aristides answered them with the present oration, which maintains a literary tone and is stylistically close to *Or. II*.² The present *oration* is exceptionally full of quotations and reminiscences of poetry.

Aristides' context

A catalogue of instances of *self-encomium* in Greek literature is included in the first section, (§§ 18-97) after the introduction, having as its aim to show that *pride* is a traditional Greek characteristic. Aristides' rhetorical intention is to argue that his παράφθεγμα was of less importance in comparison to the quoted examples.³ Extracts are culled from almost all the major genres of classical literature, starting from Homer down to Demosthenes, including nothing after him. Many of the quotations or allusions (usually in the form of simile or comparison), have a playful rhetorical effect, whereas some others are proverbial in effect. These are fairly generally distributed throughout the speech, giving also an artificial character.

Among the examples from **Homeric poetry** the passage about the “*blind old man of Chios*” at the end of the *h. Hom. Ap.*, is of special interest, since Aristides assumes it to be Homer's self-description.⁴

From **Lyric poetry** Aristides quotes: **Sappho** (1 quotation, §51); **Alcman** (3 quotations, §§51-4); **Pindar** (4 quotations, §§55-8); and **Simonides** (10 quotations, §§59-67).

¹ This oration is now lost and must not to be confused with the later *Or. XXXVII*, cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).25.

² Behr (1968a: 53), dates it to the period of Cathedra, on internal evidence.

³ Rutherford 1995: 195.

⁴ See the study of de Martino 1982: 26ff., on the implications of Aristides' treatment of the *h. Hom. Ap.*

What I aim to demonstrate in this chapter is that Aristides sees that his action has nothing in common with other Lyric poets, who spoke with arrogance about their inspiration.

An analysis of Aristides' quotations from Pindar must be preceded by a look at the context of his quotations from Sappho and Alcman, and how these lyric quotations lead up to the Pindaric ones.

1. Sappho (*fr.*55 L–P)

The section from the Lyric poetry commences with an allusion to Sappho. The quotation is preserved in a fuller form (four lines) in Stobaeus (3.4 [*περι ἀφροσύνης* 12]), and is labelled it ‘πρὸς ἀπαίδευτον γυναῖκα’ (*fr.*55 L–P). In the extant lines Sappho speaks contemptuously about an uncultivated woman, priding herself of her reputation even after death. The idea of immortality through poetry occurs first in Hesiod but Sappho, according to Aristides, speaks in a boasting way.⁵ Aristides (§51) probably has this poem in mind when he records Sappho's boast that the Muses made her truly blessed and enviable. He probably thought that Sappho referred primarily to herself and took her words as a kind of self-praise.

XXVIII. (49) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΟΣ.

51 Οἶμαι δέ σε καὶ Σαπφοῦς ἀκηκοέναι πρὸς τινὰς τῶν εὐδαιμόνων
δοκουσῶν εἶναι γυναικῶν μεγαλαυχουμένης καὶ λεγούσης. | ὥς αὐτὴν αἱ 15
Μοῦσαι τῷ ὄντι ὀλβίαν τε καὶ ζηλωτὴν ἐποίησαν καὶ | ὥς οὐδ' ἀποθανούσης
ἔσται λήθη.

(*Aristid.* 28 (49) 2,158, 13ff.K).

2. Alcman (*frs.* 30; 148; 106 P)

Three passages from the poetry of the Laconian poet are cited at §54. Alcman's implicit comparison of himself to a Muse or a Siren (*fr.*30 *PMG*), is seen as more arrogant than Aristides' statements. He treats the poet's persona in an ambivalent way varying from arrogance (cf. *fr.*148 *PMG*: priding himself), to mockery (cf. not to concern

⁵. The idea of getting kleos by composing poetry exists in *Ibyc.* 3.48 Davies *PMGF* S151.

themselves *περὶ τῶν Σκιαπόδων*), and finally to approval (cf. *fr.* 106 *PMG*: speaking like *deus ex machina*).

XXVIII. (49) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΟΣ.

54 ἐτέρωθι τοῖνον καλλωπιζόμενος παρ' ὅσοις εὐδοκιμεῖ, τοσαῦτα καὶ | τοιαῦτα
ἔθνη καταλέγει ὥστ' ἔτι νῦν τοὺς ἀθλίους γραμματιστὰς | ζητεῖν, οὐ γῆς 5
ταῦτ' εἶναι, λυσιτελεῖν δ' αὐτοῖς καὶ μακράν, ὡς | ἔοικεν, ἀπελθεῖν ὁδὸν
μᾶλλον ἢ περὶ τῶν Σκιαπόδων ἀνήνυτα πραγ|ματεύεσθαι (*frg.* 148 P).
ἀλλαχῇ δὲ οὕτω σφόδρα ἐνθεὸς γίγνεται ὥστε φαίης ἂν ὅτι οὐδ' οὕτως
κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμα ἐνθεὸς ἐστίν, | ἀλλ' αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο ὥσπερ θεὸς τῶν ἀπὸ
μηχανῆς λέγει·

εἶπατέ μοι τάδε, φῦλα βροτήσια (*fr.* 106 *PMG*).

10

πρὸς θεῶν σὺ δ' αὐτὸς ἡμῖν τίς εἶναι φήσεις;

(*Aristid.* 28 (49) 2,159, 6ff.K).

The second quotation from Alcman (§54), is of some interest since Aristides refers to the interests of grammaticists in annotating lyric texts. He observes that Alcman was fond of references to obscure foreign tribes (: ἡ περὶ τῶν Σκιαπόδων ἀνήνυτα πραγματεύεσθαι, *fr.* 148P), real and fabulous, perplexing the wretched elementary school teachers, who were seeking for their location (: τοὺς ἀθλίους γραμματιστὰς ζητεῖν, οὐ γῆς ταῦτ' εἶναι). It seems quite probable that Aristides used an ancient commentary for his quotes from Alcman. If we bear in mind that his teacher Alexander wrote commentaries on Lyric poets, it is likely that Alcman was included in it.⁶ Aristides seizes the opportunity to launch an attack on contemporary annotators, whereas before at §26 speaking disdainfully of their method in interpreting Homer's text, he calls some of them φαῦλοι.⁷

3. Pindar

Over the next four paragraphs (55-8) Aristides preserves in a playful style four extracts from Pindar's poetry, interpreted as the poet's eulogy of his own literary power. For the first and fourth quotation we have Mss and papyrological support, whereas for

⁶ This idea is suggested by Behr 1968a: 11 n.27.

⁷ Or. XXVIII.26 οὐδὲ γὰρ ὥσπερ οἱ φαῦλοι τῶν γραμματιστῶν λυμαίνονται τῷ ἔπει οὐχ οὕτως ἔχει, οἱ τὸ 'πολλόν' ἀπολύουσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ προτέρου, ἀγούσιν δ' ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ὧν ἡγείται, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἔπους ἀρχήν.

frs. 194 and 237 Aristides is our sole authority. In the first two quotations Aristides claims that Pindar praised himself as an eagle (*Ol.* II.86-8) and lion (*fr.*237), both dominant in their respective species.

The quotations from Sappho and Alcman prepare the ground for the escalation that is achieved with his quotes from Pindar, given his stance of εἰρωνία. Aristides justified his παράφθεγμα by heaping ironical remarks on the ignorance of his detractor. This is obvious in the way in which Sappho and Alcman quotations are brought in for discussion: *"I think that even you have read [ἀκηκοέναι] Sappho"*.

In the canon of the nine lyric poets that was made up by the Alexandrians Sappho was one of the masters of personal lyric, whereas Alcman together with Pindar and Simonides represented choral lyric. Aristides' quotations cover both types of lyric poetry.⁸

Pindar and Alcman are close together. Both write poetry on commission, and it is commonly believed that their songs were performed by a chorus which means that they wrote poetry for public performance. On the other hand Sappho's monodic lyric concerns private affairs.

Pindar is presented as entertaining similar views on the poet's relation to the divine agent. Sappho won eternal fame due to her association with the Muses and Alcman evoked them as his source of inspiration. The idea of co-operation and assistance received from the Muse remains intact in all lyric poets. Pindar further, emphasised the personal character of this relationship⁹ and maintains the belief that the help of the Muses is not only a fact but even a pre-condition for the creation of poetry.

⁸. Plato in *Lg.* 764d-e distinguishes between monody and choral song. It should be noticed that the ancient conception of lyric poetry embraced both types, see Lesky 1966:108.

⁹. Maehler 1963: 95-6.

III.4.1 Aristid. 28(49), 2, 159, 13-5K = Pind. *Ol.* II. 86-8.¹⁰

In the following paragraphs (55-8) Aristides dwells on Pindar's self-assertion and pride in his own skill as poet. In a series of five quotations, Pindar's statements are presented as being in agreement with those of the preceding and ensuing poets. The reader is challenged to recognise the authorship (γνώρισον *l.*12) and the meaning of the following quotations. It is *l.*23 where we are told the poet's name.

XXVIII. (49) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΟΣ.

55 Φέρε δὴ γνώρισον καὶ ταῦτα, εἰ ἄρα οἷός τε εἶ·

μαθόντες λάβροι

παγγλωσσίᾳ κόρακες ὥς ἄκραντα γαρύετον

Διὸς πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεῖον (Pind. *O.* II 86-88).

15

οὐκ ἐνταῦθα ὁ ποιητής, ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτός ἐστιν, καλεῖ κόρακας μὲν | τοὺς
ἄλλους ποιητάς, ἀετὸν δ' ἐαυτὸν πρὸς ἐκείνους; οὐκ οὐν τοσοῦτ' κρείττω
τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ἐαυτόν, ὅσον κοράκων ἀετός;

(Aristid. 28 (49) 2,159, 13-5K).

In the first two quotations Pindar's excellence is illustrated with similes from the realm of the birds and beasts.

The comparison with the eagle that Pindar made for himself is the subject of the first quote, which is also repeated in a fuller form in *Or.* II.109, and that forms for Aristides an instance of Pindar's self-praise.

The scholia assume that Pindar is making a hit at certain poetic rivals. Aristides is prepared to accept such an explanation thinking that Pindar asserts his superiority towards his opponents by referring to himself as an eagle and to them as crows.

Recent scholarship, since Bundy, treated these sublime lines with no implication of poetic rivalry.¹¹ The essential gnomic point, which Pindar wanted to make with these

¹⁰. I have also discussed this quotation in *Or.* II.109, where it is cited in a fuller form, cf. pp.171-7.

¹¹. Most nowadays would say Pindar is not referring to *specific* rivals, but that he is referring to rivals in general. Granted "the divine bird of Zeus" alludes to Pindar, then those birds chattering against the divine bird are implicitly Pindar's inferior rivals.

lines, is concerned with the contrast of the superiority of the natural ability to the acquired learning.¹²

Therefore, it is clear that Aristides twists the natural meaning of the words focusing on Pindar's proud self-consciousness. However, bearing in mind that Aristides interprets correctly Pindar's lines in *Or.* II.109 and explicitly establishes a link with a similar gnomic passage from *Ol.* IX.100-2, it is an indication that he read Pindar's words from a different point of view to suit the rhetoric of his argument.

The textual agreement of Aristides' exegesis with the tradition of the scholia suggests that he drew in his interpretation on ancient commentaries dating back to the Hellenistic time. The language of Aristides' explanation resembles that of the schol. *Ol.* II. 157 a and b from the A tradition:

<i>schol. Ol. II. 157a, b</i>	<i>Aristid. 28(49), 2,159,21-2K</i>
a. ... ἐαυτὸν λέγων ἀετὸν, κόρακας δὲ τοὺς ἀντιτέχνους. A	καλεῖ κόρακας μὲν τοὺς ἄλλους ποιητάς, ἀετὸν δ' ἐαυτὸν πρὸς ἐκείνους;
b. τοὺς εὐφυεῖς ἀετοῖς παραβάλλει, τοὺς ἀφυεῖς κόραξιν. A	οὐκ οὖν τοσοῦτω κρείττω τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ἐαυτὸν, ὅσον κοράκων ἀετός;

What emerges from the above compared texts is that Aristides' exegesis is ultimately based on the tradition of the ὑπομνηματισταί. The ancient commentators tended to read sentences one by one, out of context, and thought that what he said referred primarily to himself. Aristides' interpretation aims to contrast the parallel from Pindar with his παράθεγμα.

¹². Willcock 1995: 162.

III.4.1 Aristid. 28(49), 2, 159, 21-2K = Pind. Fr. 237.

The second quotation is introduced with a description of the occasion: “*Again he wrote as follows against one of his audience when he had seen him nodding in sleep and unaware of whose recitation he attended*”:

XXVIII. (49) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΟΣ.

56

πάλιν τοίνυν πρὸς

τινα τῶν ἀκροατῶν, ἐπειδὴ νυστάζοντα ἑώρα, | καὶ οὐκ εἰδότα ὅτῳ 20
 σύνεστιν, οὕτωςι πεποίηκεν·

ὄπισθεν δὲ κείμεαι θρασειᾶν

ἄλωπέκων ξανθὸς λέων (frg. 237).

οὐ γὰρ δὴ πού καὶ Πίνδαρον φήσεις ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ ταῦτα ἀναπεισθέντα | ἐμβαλεῖν
 εἰς τὴν ποίησιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ.

(Aristid. 28 (49) 2, 159, 21-2K).

Pindar Fr. 237

ὄπισθεν δὲ κείμεαι θρασειᾶν ἄλωπέκων ξανθὸς¹³ λέων (fr.237).

This is a clearly distinguishable quotation in *direct speech*, whose authorship is clearly stated.

As the language is here that of an animal fable we may not find it difficult to imagine that Aristides thought that Pindar praised himself as a lion, which offers the symbol of power that Pindar claims for his own art (self-assertion). On the other hand the fox provides for the poet a fixed representation of cunning and treachery and in this respect functions as a foil to lion-poet. The adjective θρασειᾶν is used in a pejorative sense, suggesting that the implied individual is contrasted to the poet's supremacy.¹⁴

Pindar was fond of animal-images which serve as metaphors for distinctive qualities of the men.¹⁵ Thus, in a humorous style fr. 237 uses the metaphor of the lion

¹³. Fogelmark (1972: 31), propounds that ξανθός should not be considered as colour-word in lyric poets. However, Pindar does use ξανθός as indicative of colour, relating it to φοινίκιος and red colour. Pindar and Bacchylides use ξανθός to describe the colour of animals' fur (Pyth. IV.149, 205; B. 5.37).

¹⁴. For accounts of the characters attributed to lion and fox see Thompson 1936, and Keller 1909-1913.

¹⁵. Steiner (1986: 99), argues that “the many tenors the animal carries points to its particular suitability for metaphoric representation”. This is in line with Bundy's idea (1986: 29), that animal figures are symbolic representations of the qualities praised.

and the fox as means of distinguishing and portraying two different models of behaviour.¹⁶

The lion-symbol is interpreted by Aristides as exemplifying self-praise, and is in tune with the sublime lines in *Olympian Two*.¹⁷ It is noteworthy that Aristides' παράφθεγμα and Pindar's remark share the fact that both were said outside the course of the speech / recitation and in this respect both are forms of περιαιτολογία.

Pindar's image of the lion as symbol for the poet is further echoed in *Or.* II.425, where Aristides identifies the rareness of a real orator with that of lions and all the nobler animals among the others.

The hierarchy between the couples (lion – fox) and (eagle – crows), is emphasised by Pindar on the assumption that the basic animal nature remains unchangeable;¹⁸ in this respect the distance between the poet and the inferior individual cannot be bridged, just as the crows chattering ineffectively against the divine bird of the Zeus are unable to change their nature.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 237

The fragmentary state of Pindar's lines as well as the anecdotal character of the quotation precludes a decision about the original composition. But what is quite clear in Aristides' context is that he explicitly acknowledges the words as Pindar's. If we believe Aristides' last words ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν ποίησιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ (*l.* 24), then it is possible that Pindar indeed had included these lines in a lost poem. Behind the words of the quotation is recognisable a Greek meter.¹⁹ In addition, the introductory formula οὕτως πεποίηκεν indicates verbatim quotation; the same formula is also employed later in §60 in introducing *Sim. fr.* 175Ed=89W [ἀλλ' αὐτὸς εἰς ἑαυτὸν πεποίηκεν].

¹⁶ On the base of Aristides' interpretation, the animal images in *fr.* 237 define according to **Bundy** (1986: 30), two opposing attitudes towards the laudandus, of which the lion is a symbol of quality for the poet. Bundy (1986: 30) without seeing any definite allusion, conjectures that the foxes here are mere technicians, with whom the straightforward lion confidently vies in praise of a given laudandus.

¹⁷ Surprisingly, in *Isth.* IV.45-8 the pancratiast Melissos is praised for combining the qualities of both animals. The devious way of the fox is acceptable only under the circumstance of defending oneself. See **Willcock** 1995: *ad loc.* In *Ol.* XI.19-20 both animals exemplifying the inborn quality.

¹⁸ **Steiner** 1986: 101-2.

¹⁹ If the quotation was in prose we should expect the ὥσπερ / ὥς introducing the second member of the comparison.

Aristides' reference to the circumstance under which Pindar mentioned this gnome gives to his quotation a purely anecdotal character. Aristides may have known this anecdote from an ancient *vita* in which various stories may have been collected as those recorded in P.Oxy. 2438 (life of Pindar), and in later Byzantine biographies: *vit. Ambr.*, *vit. Thom.*, and *vit. metrica*. Stories about Pindar's life had deeply impressed the imagination of antiquity and many of the transmitted anecdotes originated in his poetry. Recent scholarship has shown that a great proportion of the material in the lives of all the poets is basically fictional. In Pindar's case his references to symbolic representation of his poetry inspired anecdotal explanations. The ancient biographer probably taking the lines out of context created the anecdote about the circumstances of performance to explain Pindar's line.²⁰

It should be stressed on this point that the evidence about Aristides' source is very thin and it does not enable us to draw any definite conclusion about where and how Aristides found the quotation at issue.

²⁰. A similar case concerns Aristodemus' exegesis of the epiphany of the Mother of the gods that Pindar experienced (schol. *Pyth.* III.137b). Lefkowitz (1981: 61), has shown that Aristodemus' account may in part be based on Pindar's original hymn.

III.4.1 Aristid. 28(49), 2,159,25-7&3-5K=Pind. Fr.194 1-3,4-5.

Pindar Fr. 194

Pindar's poetry is intended to be splendid and seeks to impress. One of the means employed by Pindar in attaining this end concerns the use of ornamental epithets, adjectives and substantives denoting brilliance, which contribute to this effect of grandeur. Pindar formulates his praise to Thebes "building" on an already established tradition. (The polis of Thebes, myth has it, was founded when the sound of Amphion's lyre literally built the city walls).²¹

FR. 194 (206).

<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ >

κεκρότῃται χρυσέα κρηπὶς ἱεραῖσιν ἀοιδαῖς·
εἷα τειχίζωμεν ἤδη ποικίλον
κόσμον αὐδάεντα λόγων

* *
*

καὶ πολυκλείταν περ ἑοῖσαν ὅμως
5 Θήβαν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπασκῆσει θεῶν
καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγνιάς

- I. *Plut. mon. democr. olig.* 1 p.826A κεκρότῃται — ἀοιδαῖς;
II. *idem quom. quis sent. prof. virt.* 17 p.86A κεκρότῃται — κρηπὶς;
III. *Luc. Demosth. enc.* 11 χρυσέα κρηπὶς;
IV. *Clem. Alex. paedag.* 1, 1, 1, 1, (89,25 St.) κεκρότῃται κρηπὶς ἀληθείας.

The development of the song is paralleled with the rising of a wall, and the metaphor emanates from the 'building'.²² The comparison between poems and parts of the edifice is not infrequent in Pindar, and the most usual parts are the bases (κρηπῖδα) and the portals (πρόθυρα).

In *fr.* 194 Pindar has started the beginning of his poem by laying down a "golden foundation" for the "sacred songs" which are going to increase the existing glory of Thebes, such a task apart from poetic skill requires divine support. The citizens of Thebes are invited to participate in the praise to their city. So, we can assume with Nagy that as

²¹ *Hes. fr.* 182 MW; *Paus.* 6.20.18.

²² The image of the metaphor was of Pindar's most favourite; cf. *Pyth.* IV.138 βάλλετο κρηπῖδα σοφῶν ἐπέων; VII.3/4 κρηπῖδ' ἀοιδᾶν βαλέσθαι; *Luc. Hipp.* 4 κρηπῖδα ... βεβαιοτάτην βαλλόμενος.

the subject of τειχίζωμεν is implied a chorus of Thebans, which in a metaphorical sense is represented as if they were rebuilding the walls of Thebes.²³

The architectural metaphor, reinforced by τειχίζωμεν ... κόσμον, denotes a beautiful 'arrangement' or adorned 'composition' of the song creating a kind of internal artistry.²⁴

Aristides' context

The fragment is quoted in two parts by Aristides. The quotation of the lines 1-3 is followed by a puzzling invocation to Heracles:

XXVIII. (49) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΟΣ.

57 ἄκουε δὴ καὶ ἐτέρων·
κεκρότηται χρυσέα κρηπὶς ἱεραῖσιν ἀοιδαῖς· 25
εἶα τειχίζωμεν ἤδη ποικίλον
κόσμον αὐδάεντα λόγων (frg. 194,1—3).
Ἡράκλεις, ταυτὶ μὲν οὐδὲ παντάπασιν ἀναίτια τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ἀλλ' | ὅμως καὶ 1
ἐπὶ τούτοις σεμνύνεται ὥς οὐδὲν ἀτιμοτέροις τοῦ νέκταρος, καὶ φησιν ὅτι
οὗτος μέντοι ὁ τῶν λόγων κόσμος
καὶ πολυκλειτάν περ ἑοῦσαν ὅμως Θήβαν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἐπασκῆσει
θεῶν
καὶ κατ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγυιάς (ibid. v.4.5), 5
ὥσπερ οὐκ ἄρκοῦν εἰ κατὰ ἀνθρώπους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς | ἔτι
μειζόνως τιμήσοντας δι' ἐκείνον τὴν τῶν Θηβαίων πόλιν εἰς | τὸ λοιπόν.

^{οι}
25 ἱερῇσιν UT 26 εἶα Bergk: εἶα A pr. m., accentus non fuit: οἶα SQU, οἶα T τειχίζωμεν AS:
τειχίζομεν QUT ποικίλων corr. Bergk 3 ἑοῦσαν: ἐοῖσαν Boeckh ad ἐπασκῆσει cf. Nem. IX.10

(Aristid. 28 (49) 2,159-60,25-7, 3-5 K).

Aristides, expressing a sort of displeasure for Pindar's style, finds some blemishes in the quotation (οὐδὲ παντάπασιν ἀναίτια τοῖς ῥήμασιν), and rebukes Pindar for priding himself upon his diction "as if [it] were no less valuable than nectar". Aristides' reaction becomes stronger after his quotation of ll.4-5 in criticising Pindar's words as examples of excessive self-praise. He finds Pindar's attitude arrogant in

²³. Nagy 1990: 145.

²⁴. For the various meanings ascribed to κόσμος see Nagy 1990: 145 n.45, 430.

presenting himself as the main reason for a future praise from the gods thanks to his poetry.

The intention of the Theban poet is to praise his native city with a striking image. His material is not new since he employed it in praising other cities and victorious athletes. Thus, already old material is reworked in producing a new splendid praise. In doing so, he refers to the divine succour which in conjunction with his poetic ability can secure even greater glory and fame for Thebes.

It is interesting here to see how Aristides utilises poetry to his own advantage, which in turn rests on the question whether the interpretation that Aristides offers is really what a poet like Pindar meant. Aristides quotes Pindar's words as another instance exemplifying the poet's self-praise. He tries to read Pindar's words believing that the poet is talking about himself.

Aristides does not seem to take into consideration the original circumstances under which the poem was composed. He lived many centuries later and was unable to imagine how Pindar composed his songs. The crucial difference is between oral performance and written poetry. Aristides read poetry from the book whereas Pindar wrote these words to be sung by the chorus to a Theban audience. In the ideology of the choral lyric poetry the chorus represents the polis.²⁵ They sound so confident because they have a wonderful song for Thebes of which Pindar says that there is a beautiful base.

It is naive to say that Pindar praised himself in this impressive opening. His poetical intention is to coin a flattering compliment for his fellow-citizens and not to make an advertisement of his poetic skill. We can hardly credit Pindar with such an intention who elsewhere in his poetry was fond of striking and impressive openings; this predilection is stated epigrammatically in the προοίμιον of *Ol.VI.3-4*: ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόσωπον χρῆ θέμεν τηλαυγές.

25. **Burnett** (1985: 50 and 175 n.6), surveys a number of passages where the epinician poet equates the chorus with polis.

Concluding, we can say that Aristides thinks that Pindar spoke in arrogant terms about his poetic skills. He explicitly attempts to counterbalance his milder remark in passing with what he thought to be excessive self-praise in Pindar's pronouncement. The link that Aristides attempts to establish through this quotation functions on the level of poetic / rhetorical creation, whereas in the other three Pindaric quotes his focus moves on the level of the poet's personality and his relation to the divine expressed in terms of self-*encomium*. In final analysis the attempted comparison sets his oratory on a par with Pindar's poetry.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 194

The opening phrase of *fr.* 194 was particularly favoured in late antiquity.²⁶ Plutarch quotes it twice, Lucian and Clemens quote it in a shorter form, without anyone mentioning the poet's name as if it was familiar. The last two seem to misinterpret *l.* 1, which in the text of Clemens is quoted in a metaphorical sense signifying the κρηπίς of the truth. Given the popularity of this line among the Imperial age authors it is possible that it was included in an anthology.²⁷

Aristides splits his quotation into two segments; however it is clear from the immediate context that both were in consecutive order in the original poem. Aristides' οὗτος μέντοι ὁ τῶν λόγων κόσμος – that comes after the introductory formula of the second part (*ll.* 4-5) καί φησιν ὅτι –, is a paraphrase of the last line of the former part of the quotation, and it governs the following ἐπασκήσει. Thus, *ll.* 4-5 is the natural continuation of *ll.* 1-3, otherwise the splendid image of opening lines loses its strength if it is kept for long in mind: the beautiful song that Pindar just composed is going to increase the future glory of Thebes.

The fact that Aristides joins together both parts of *fr.* 194 may suggest the possibility that he knew a more complete text than Lucian and Clemens did.

²⁶ Wilamowitz (1922: 189), supposes that it was a hymn.

²⁷ The transmission of Pind. *fr.* 110 illustrates a similar case. The first line became a proverb by the II cent. AD, “γλυκὺς ἀπείρω πόλεμος” (Diogenian. III.94; Apostol. V.51); then it is cited in a commentary on Th. II.1-45 (P.Oxy. 6, 853 [II AD]), and finally finds its place in Stob. *Flor.* 4,9,3, among other quotations illustrating the perilous results of πόλεμος.

Aristides' sentence ὥς οὐδὲν ἀτιμότεροις τοῦ νέκταρος deserves some consideration. We can think of two possibilities:

Pindar often uses the '*nectar*' and the '*wine*' as metaphors for his poetry and therefore it is possible that Aristides had in mind *Ol.* VII.7, which he also quoted in *Or.* XXXIX.16, where Pindar calls the poem he offers to Diagoras νέκταρ or, less likely, Aristides may draw on an unknown Hellenistic commentary.

III.4.1 Aristid. 28(49), 2, 160, 9-13K = Pind. Pae. VI. 1-6.

Aristides' context

This is the fourth Pindaric quotation in a list of four in total, the earlier items of which are there primarily to prepare for the final one, which Aristides presents as a point of particular interest. The introductory ἔτι λαμπρότερον indicates that Aristides constructed his quotes from Pindar in a form resembling a *priamel* which now reaches a crescendo.²⁸ The opening six lines of the *Pae. VI* are quoted verbatim, for which the principal source is P.Oxy. 841.²⁹

XXVIII. (49) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΦΘΕΓΜΑΤΟΣ.

58 ἐτέρωθι (frg. 52 f) δὲ ἔτι λαμπρότερον·

Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς σε
χρυσέα κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσσί᾽ τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτᾳ
ἐν ζαθέῳ με δέξαι χρόνῳ
αἰίδιμον Πιερίκδων προφάταν.

10

ὁρᾷς ὥς εὐχόμενος μεταξὺ οὐ κατέσχευεν ἑαυτόν, ἀλλὰ κἀνταῦθα |
ἔσεμνολογήσατο. καίτοι τίς ἂν ἦν τυχὼν τῶν ἐκ τῆς εὐχῆς, ὅς | εὐθύς 15
59 ἀρχόμενος τῆς εὐχῆς τοσοῦτον ἐφ' αὐτῷ φρονεῖ [εἰπὼν εἰς | αὐτόν]; Μυρίου
τοίνυν ἐτέρους ἔχων εἰπεῖν οὐδὲ πολλοῦ τινος | ἀξίους ἀνθρώπους
ἐπαρθέντας ἐφ' αὐτοῖς φρονῆσαι, ἐξεπίτηδες | παραλείπω, δεδοικῶς μὴ
περιστήσω τὸν λόγον εἰς τούναντίον, ὥς | ἄρα καὶ φαύλων εἴη τὸ τὰ 20
τοιαῦτα κοσμεῖν ἑαυτούς.

11 λίσσομαι Canter: ἀ(ι)σομαι O χάριτεσσί τε G. Hermann (*iam antea 'cum Gratiis et Veuer'* in versione Canter); χάριτέσ τε AQTS²; χάρισ τε, ut videtur S¹, χάριτάσ τε U ἀφροδίτα ASQT, ἀφροδίτη U 12 χρόνῳ ASQT: χωρῷ U; χορῷ Bergk; 13 Πιερίδων Canter: περίων AQUTS², περίον S¹

(Aristid. 28 (49) 2,160,9-13 K).

²⁸. Aristides follows this technique elsewhere in the present speech in presenting a group of quotations from the same author, where the firsts of them seem rather moderate compared to the much greater self-confidence displayed with the one that comes last. A good instance is in §74, the introductory formula of his quote from Th. II. 62,3 (from Pericles' speech): καὶ ταυτὶ μὲν καὶ μετριώτερα· ἀλλ' ὅρα τὰς ὑπερβολάς.

²⁹. Grenfell-Hunt 1908: no.841. Parts of the paean have been restored by PSI 147.

Aristides has himself been interested in Pindar's pronouncements about the nature of his own art at the opening part of *Pae.* VI,³⁰ which he considers as a kind of excessive self-praise.

The *Paean* was composed for the people of Delphi for performance at a religious occasion (Theoxenia),³¹ and it begins with a prayer to be received at Delphi as coming from the “αοίδιμος Πιερίδων προφάτας”.³²

In Pindar's invocation to the personified Pytho,³³ l.6 attracted Aristides' interest. The main question is why Aristides saw a boastful attitude in Pindar's words. Here we can consider the following possible reasons:

1. προφήτης³⁴

The προφήτης designates a figure in society whose hereditary role was to formalise in verse the inspiration received by a μάντις.³⁵

Pindar's idea is not unparalleled; the nearest parallel is at B. 8.3 Μουσᾶν προφάτας,³⁶ and the earliest literary record appears in *Th.* 31-2, where the Muses inspired Hesiod to ἵνα κλείοιμι τὰ τ' ἐσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα.³⁷

The diction of early poetry represents a stage where the prophecy of the inspired μάντις and its poetical formalization by προφήτης, are as yet one. In Pindar we are witnessing a relic of this undifferentiated stage, where the word προφήτης designates the poet as the one who declares, interprets, and formalises the voice of the Muse.³⁸ He is

³⁰. Hoekstra's argument (1961: 1-14.), that the subject of l.6 is the chorus, is refuted by Fogelmark 1972: 119 with n.16.

³¹. Cf. Radt 1958: 102; Bona 1988: 99-101. On the question of the date and the connection of the poem with *Nem.* VII see: Kirkwood 1982: 257; Fogelmark 1972: 116ff.; Bona 1988: 103.

³². Bona translates: “*me interprete famoso delle Pieridi*”; however the correct translation may be “*interpreter of the Pierians in song*”, which is followed by Harriot 1969: 59 with n.1, 88; Dodds 1951: 82 with n.122.

³³. This is not an eponymous Pythian goddess, see Bona 1988: *ad loc.*

³⁴. Fascher 1927: 4-7 (meaning), 11-3 (Pindar); Fontenrose 1978: 218ff.

³⁵. The role of both figures is explicitly differentiated in Plato's *Ti.* 72a ὅθεν δὴ καὶ τὸ τῶν προφητῶν γένος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐνθείοις μαντείαις κριτὰς ἐπικαθιστάναι νόμος. The same idea is reflected in *R.* 392d.

³⁶. On this theme see Maehler 1982: vol.II.150.

³⁷. The fact that Hesiod's verse was burlesqued by Lucian 67.1, provides witness that he made no clear distinction between the μαντοσύνα and poetry.

³⁸. Some scholars have been inclined to identify the role of ποιητής with that of prophetic characters in Pindar's myths e.g. Illig (1932: 24) on Teiresias (*Nem.* I) and Cheiron (*Pyth.* IX), Segal (1974: 38) on Teiresias, Hubbard (1985: 42) and Gianotti (1975a: 55) on Cheiron (*Nem.* III).

the “spokesman” of God whose function is to show others what he knows from his god. A particularly striking example is *fr.* 150 μαντεύεο, Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ.³⁹

Aristides, who distinguishes clearly between both figures (cf. *Ors.* II.52; XLV.7), may have assumed that Pindar boasted with προφήτης claiming for himself both the attribute of prophet and that of seer.⁴⁰ In fact Aristides should not have treated Pindar's words as boast, since he repeats a current notion of the archaic age, which shows what importance is attached to the poet's task as a means by which divine revelations are made to humans.

2. ἀοίδιμος

Aristides having in mind the Pindaric use of ἀοίδιμος as a favourite epithet for Athens, may have misinterpreted the meaning of the word taking it to mean “*much sung of*” or “*renowned in song*” (cf. *fr.* 76). However, an active meaning is implied:⁴¹ “*rich in songs*”.⁴²

3. Χαρίτεσσιν τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτῃ

Aristides seems to take Pindar's prayer to Pytho as suggesting that he saw himself as ἀοίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν in the company of the Charites and Aphrodite.⁴³ Aristides probably thought that Pindar attempted to elevate himself to a divine level, which provoked his censure and sarcastic question: “*what would he have been like if he had achieved his prayers...?*”. The Charites and Aphrodite are invoked as the goddesses of beauty and delight, these elements are claimed by Pindar for his art.

³⁹ Teiresias is generally known as a μάντις (*Od.* 11.99), but in *Nem.* I.60 is the προφήτης of Zeus. Cf. Nagy 1990: 162-3.

⁴⁰ Similarly at *Or.* XXVIII.92 Aristides assumes that [Cratinus?] boasted at the beginning of his play like a “*prophet*”: καὶ τις αὐτῶν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ δράματος μεγαλαυχούμενος ὡς προφήτης προαγορεύει... Cf. *Or.* XLV.4 where he calls the poets ironically “*prophets*” of the gods.

⁴¹ Verdenius 1987: on *Ol.* XIV.3; Bona 1988: *ad loc.*

⁴² Cf. a similar interpretation propounded by Bowra 1964: 3, who sees Aristides' misunderstanding in the meaning of ἀοίδιμος.

⁴³ See the discussion in Radt 1958: 103-4 and the parallels quoted there. Radt, following Wilamowitz, argues that Χαρίτες τε καὶ σὺν Ἀφροδίτῃ goes with με δέξαι. Radt quotes parallels in which the chorus arrives together with Χαρίτες and Ἀφροδίτῃ, who give grace. The meaning of σὺν is ‘helped by’, ‘assisted by’, ‘supported by’. This interpretation is followed by Bona 1988: 119. I agree that it is more natural to think that Pindar relied on the help of Graces and Aphrodite.

Nonetheless, Aristides treated Pindar's words in isolation from the social context of the original poem, as he also did with *fr.* 194.

The most nearly complete of the papyrus fragments, *Paean* VI, was composed for the festival of Theoxenia at Delphi, a ceremony intended to avert the famine in Greece, which this year lacked a chorus and an appropriate song.

Aristides does not seem to take into consideration that Pindar furnished the *paean* as a gift for the festival, and coached a chorus of Theban young men for the performance. The invocation to Pytho in the opening part of the prayer is meant to be sung by the chorus who is going to perform the *paean*.⁴⁴ We should also imagine that Pindar himself supervised the performance as the leader of the chorus.

It is evident that Pindar wishes to bring out the important role of the chorus, for he explicitly says in *ll.* 9-10, that there was a shortage of men for the impending festival and that he came to dance and redeem the worshippers from the existing embarrassment:

ΔΕΛΦΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΠΥΘΩ (fr.52f)
 A' col. 23
 ὕδατι γὰρ ἐπὶ χαλκοπύλῳ
 ψόφον αἰῶν Κασταλίας
 ὁρφανὸν ἀνδρῶν χορεύσιος ἦλθον
 ἔταις ἀμαχανίαν ἀ[λ]έξων
 τεοῖσιν ἐμαῖς τε τιμ[α]ῖς.
 (Pae. VI.7-11).

Aristides, reading Pindar's words many centuries later from a book, thought that the speaker was only Pindar. It would have been more reasonable for Aristides to blame Pindar for boasting at *l.*11 where he vindicates his own honour as a poet. This is an indication that Aristides interpreted *ll.*1-6 independently without taking into consideration Pindar's poetic aim and the social character of his art.

Aristides appeals to the conventions of Greek poetry, which require that epic heroes assert their superiority in the face of their adversaries, and which allow a lyric poet

⁴⁴. While in the *Ἑπίνικοι* the first person refers to the poet himself, though sometimes including his chorus, in several of the *paean*s the case is different. So, in *Pae.* II the 'I' is the chorus of the Abderitan singers; similarly in *Pae.* IV the chorus of Ceans speak in the first person. These poems are less personal than the *Ἑπίνικοι*; on that see Lefkowitz 1963: 185-95.

to pose as a divinely inspired genius. His ostensible aim is to justify the incidental self-praise dropped while delivering a prose-hymn.⁴⁵

Pindar's description in *Pae.* VI of a divinely inspired and sanctioned poet is presented as bolder than his own remarks in passing, so that he can argue *a fortiori* that his παράφθεγμα was comparatively trivial.

Aristides wants to make the following points:

1. Pindar praised himself in his poetry just as he did in the παράφθεγμα.
2. To show that Pindar's words form examples of excessive self-praise.
3. Pindar's arrogance in *Pae.* VI.1-6 was premeditated, whereas the παράφθεγμα was extempore and it was said outside his speech.
4. Aristides wants to demonstrate that *self-assertion* is not allowable especially in the course of a prayer.

With Pindar, Aristides' review of poet's self-praise reaches a climax; the rhetor himself expresses concern that he is criticising examples of excessive praise so much that he might end up proving that self-praise is bad (§59).

The source for Pind. *Pae.* VI.1-6

The remark that Pindar “*right at the beginning of his prayer is so proud of himself*”, indicates that Aristides was in a position to place Pindar's boast within that section of the poem dedicated to his prayer, and for which we can assume that he knew its beginning and end. He notes explicitly the exact beginning of Pindar's prayer and the whole wording suggests a poem's *initium*, for which we have papyrological support.

The fact that Aristides acknowledges the position in the original text for some of his quotations in this speech, gives weight to the possibility that he knew them from the complete editions of the authors. This can be better seen in the following instances:

1. In (§95), he places his references to Isocrates' *Panegyricus* (IV.14), at the *exordium* and the *peroratio* of the oration: τοῦτο μὲν ἀρχόμενος τοῦ προοιμίου

⁴⁵. Aristides' remarks form part of a rich rhetorical tradition known as περιαιτολογία, as the rhetoricians called it, which dates from the first to third centuries AD. On the cases where περιαιτολογία is acceptable, see Rutherford 1995: 199-201.

ὑπισχνόμενος... καὶ πρὸς γ' ἔτι προστιθεὶς ὅτι... τοῦτο δ' ἐν τοῖς τελευταίοις (*ibid* 188).

2. In his quote from Thucydides II.60-4, he noted that Pericles boasted of his rhetorical ability right at the beginning of his speech: καὶ ταῦτα ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ λόγου.

3. In (§92), Aristides places Cratinus' boast at the beginning of his drama: ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ δράματος μεγαλυνόμενος... προαγορεύει τοιάδε (*fr.* 306K).⁴⁶

4. Aristides earlier in §20, cites three lines from the opening part of *Theogony* (ll. 22,11,18), placing them explicitly in the hymn to Muses: ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἀρξάμενος τῆς θεογονίας καὶ τὰς Μούσας ὕμνων εὐθύς λέγει.

Since Aristides does the same in his quote from Pindar, we must consider the possibility that Aristides knew the *Paean* from his rhetorical studies, and that he may have indexed the opening lines among others from a wide range of authors as examples of 'περιαντολογία'. These personal index-notes may also have included a note about the place of the extracts in the original text.

The classification of his quotations in the whole speech gives us some idea of the range of his readings and interests. The arrangement of his quotations in the order of their literary genres suggests that Aristides follows the structure of the reading-list: *poetry*, *history*, *oratory*, *philosophy*. This is the same as the order recorded in Quintilian, *IO* 10.1, and Dio of Prusa, *Or.* XVIII (*περὶ λόγων ἀσκήσεως*):⁴⁷

Aristides' quotation suffered a good deal in the manuscript tradition which preserves slight textual variants, amended successfully by Hermann, Canter and Keil before the publication of P.Oxy. 841. Community in error and progressive corruption suggests a common archetype:

Χαρίτεσσί τε:	χάριτέσ τε AQT ^S ² ; χάρισ τε S ¹ , χάριτάς τε U
Πιρίδων:	πιρίων AQT ^S ² ; πιρίον S ¹ .

However, Aristides' αἰδῖμον is confirmed by the papyrus.

⁴⁶. A scholion in *Parisinus Gr.* 3005 thinks of Eupolis' *Maricas* as the source.

⁴⁷. See Introduction 5.1.

III.4.2 Aristid. 27(16), 2, 125, 9K = Pind. Fr. 108(a).

Introduction to *Or. XXVII ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΟΣ ΕΝ ΚΥΖΙΚΩΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΝΑΟΥ*

In September AD 166, after two severe illnesses, smallpox in AD 165 and another debilitating disease in AD 166, Aristides was prompted by Asclepius in a dream to visit Cyzicus and to participate in the Cyzicene Olympiad and in the dedication of the reconstructed temple of Hadrian.¹ The temple was begun under Hadrian and completed in the reign of Antoninus Pius, as a new site for the provincial worship of Rome and the emperors of the Κοινόν of Asia.² The earthquake of AD 161 severely damaged the temple.³ The repairs were completed by AD 166 (cf. §§22, 40-1), and a festival for the temple was held at the time of the Cyzicene Olympiad;⁴ on this occasion Aristides delivered his *Πανηγυρικός ἐν Κυζίκῳ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ*.⁵

Most of Aristides' speech is devoted not to the temple but to praising the harmony of Marcus and Lucius and to exhorting the cities of Asia to follow their example (§§23-39).⁶

Aristides' context

In the proem (§§1-4) Aristides refers to the occasion of the present speech: (the Cyzicene Olympiad and the reconstruction of the temple).⁷ Everyone would have sufficient reason for speaking for Cyzicus; however, the reason invoked by Aristides emanates from his deep commitment to Asclepius' divine will. He states explicitly: ὁ γὰρ Ἀσκληπιὸς κελεύει λέγειν.

In the time of Cathedra (AD 145-147), after Aristides' arrival at Pergamum, Asclepius appealed to the orator's vanity and launched him on a new study of rhetoric.⁸ Now 21 years later, Aristides received a prophecy in a dream telling him to present this speech to Cyzicus (*Hieros Logos* 5 [51].11-6), even though his health had not improved.⁹

¹. In Anth.Pal. IX 656 the temple was regarded as one of the seven wonders of the world. It is unclear for whom the temple was originally intended, cf. Behr 1968a: 101 n.20.

². Cf. Chronicon Paschale, p.475 Dind.; Malalas XI, p.279 Bonn.; schol. Luc. *Icar.* 24 Rabe p.107.

³. Cf. Dio Cassius LXIX 15.4, Aristid. *Or.*XXXI.13. For the earthquake cf. Behr 1968a: 92 n.1b, and Magie 1950: vol.II. 1472-3.

⁴. Schulz - Winter 1990: 41.

⁵. Boulanger (1923: 162), dates the speech in AD 161; for 167— Swain 1996: 285 n.118.

⁶. The oration was delivered twice, cf. *Hieros Logos* 5 (51).16. Aristides extols the harmony between the two Emperors Marcus and Verus (§§ 23-39), who are compared to Asclepius and Sarapis.

⁷. Behr 1968a: 101 n.20.

⁸. Cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).14-30.

⁹. *Hieros Logos* 5 (51).16.

His devotion to his healing god was sufficiently great to take him out of himself and render him oblivious to his physical discomfort.¹⁰

XXVII. (16) ΠΑΝΗΓΥΡΙΚΟΣ ΕΝ ΚΥΖΙΚΩΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΝΑΟΥ.

- 1 "Ἀπασι μὲν, ὥς ἐγὼ νομίζω, προφάσεις ἱκαναὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὥς | ἐν τῷ
παρόντι· ἢ τε γὰρ πόλις ἀξία σπουδῆς, εἰ δὴ τις ἄλλη τῶν | Ἑλληνίδων, τό
τε ἔργον ἐφ' ᾧ τὴν ἱερομηνίαν ποιεῖται μέγιστον | τῶν εἰς ὄψιν ἐλθόντων
ἀνθρώποις, οἳ τε καιροὶ τῶν πώποτε | ἄριστοι καὶ τελεώτατοι· ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ 5
2 μάλιστα ἐναργῆς ἡ πρόφασις | καὶ τῆς συνηθείας τοῦ βίου τοῦ ἡμετέρου. ὁ
γὰρ Ἀσκληπιὸς κελεύει λέγειν· ὥστ' οὗτ' ἀσθένειαν σώματος οἶόν τε
ὑπολογίσα|σθαι πρὸς γε αὐτὸν τὸν σωτῆρα οὔτε τῆς ὑποθέσεως τὸ μέγεθος |
καταδεῖσαι μὴ οὐ ράδιον ἢ τυχεῖν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἔφη Πίνδαρος | (frg. 108a),
θεοῦ δείξαντος ἀρχὴν οὐδὲν δὴ τὸ κωλῦον, ἄλλως | τε καὶ οὐ νῦν 10
πρῶτον αὐτοῦ πειρώμεθα, ἀλλ' ἐν πολλοῖς τε καὶ | μεγάλοις καὶ πρόσθεν
ἔγνωμεν ἐφ' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν, οὐχ ἐτέρων, ὅπο|σον τι τῆς ῥαστώνης αὐτῷ
περίεστιν κὰν τοῖς καθάπαξ ἀπόροις | εἶναι δοκοῦσιν, [καὶ] μὴ ὅτι τοῖς
3 χαλεποῖς μὲν, ἀπογνῶναι δ' οὐκ | ἀναγκαίως ἔχουσιν. ἐγὼ γοῦν πρὸς 15
τοσοῦτον ἤκω τοῦ πιστεύειν | ἐτέρῳ μελήσειν, ὥστε οὐκ οἶδα ὄντινα τρόπον
αὐτοσχεδιάζω, πλὴν | ὅσον οὐκ ἀπὸ στόματος παντελῶς, ἀλλὰ γράφων
ἔτι. οὔτε γὰρ | πρόσθεν ἔγνωμεν ὅ τι χρὴ λέγειν, πρὶν ἔδει λέγειν ἤδη, ὅ τε
προσ|τάξας μείζων ἀπάσης ἔμοιγε παρασκευῆς.

(Aristid. 27 (16) 2,125,9-11 K).

In the proem of this oration (§2), Aristides is not prepared to argue with his Saviour the objective difficulties in accomplishing the god's will. This stance is strikingly illustrated with a quotation from a Pindar's *Hyporchema* fr. 108 (a) ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἔφη Πίνδαρος, θεοῦ δείξαντος ἀρχὴν οὐδὲν δὴ τὸ κωλῦον (: "when god has shown the beginning", there is no obstacle).

Pindar Fr. 108(a)

The earliest quotation of fr.108(a) occurs in the *Epistulae Socratis*, 1.7 (p.610H.=11,6 Köhl), where it is identified as from a *hyporchema*. Fragments 108 (a+b), along with half a dozen short passages, are what remains of Pindar's two books of

¹⁰. Cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).22, 38; *Or.* XX.3.

Hyporchemata.¹¹ Modern editors of the fragment have accepted Blass' proposal to group this fragment with *fr.* 108 (b), quoted by Clem. Alex. *strom.* 5, 14, 101 (2, 393 St.). The metrical correspondence (iambic and aeolic) and the great similarity in the subject matter strongly confirm this hypothesis.¹²

HYPORCHEMATA FR. 108 (75+106=142 Schr.)

- (a) θεοῦ δὲ δείξαντος ἀρχάν
ἕκαστον ἐν πρᾶγος, εὐθεῖα δὴ
³κέλευθος ἀρετὰν ἐλεῖν,
τελευταί τε καλλίονες.

I. *epist. Socr.* 1,7 (p.610H.=11,6 Köhl.) ἀπειθεῖν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁκνῶ καὶ τὸν Πίνδαρον ἡγούμενος εἰς τοῦτο εἶναι σοφόν, ὅς φησι· Θεοῦ— καλλίονες· σχεδὸν γὰρ οὕτω που αὐτῷ ἔχει;

II. *Aristid.* 27(16), 2,125,9-11 K.

III. *Aristid.* 33(51), 2,228,3 K.

The subject is the relationship of man to god. Pindar's statement seems to strike a note of caution: something as important as the achievement of ἀρετή, implies divine favour.

In Pindar the emphasis seems to be the contrast between the beginning ἀρχά and the end τελευτά. If the God shows the beginning, the outcome will be better. Pindar said it with reference to the song. We could accept that as an address/praise to the God, in this *hyporchema* Pindar may have started with a prayer and then proceeded with *fr.* 108 (a): when the god shows the beginning the end is better.

Aristides in a more personal text, quotes only the first line of *fr.* 108 (a), to justify his attitude in accomplishing god's order. He takes a part and gives a much more general sense. The emphasis goes on the *omnipotence* of the god and only in this respect does he agree with Pindar. However, his immediately following statement οὐδὲν δὴ τὸ κωλύον gives to the quotation a more personal nuance as Aristides examines its application to his personal experience. The obstacles that he refers to are what he has already stated as

¹¹. The very few surviving fragments of Ὑπορχήματα by Pindar and Bacchylides give little indication of form or content. The references in ancient literature fail to define the characteristic features of this mode of composition, which was especially composed for dancing performances as we can judge from the etymology of the word. Kirkwood (1982: 336), suggests that the hyporcheme originated as a form of hymn to Apollo.

¹². West (1980), gives his version of the metrical scheme, postulating as its basic unit an iambic metron in ten forms, and uses this scheme to explain the meter of *fr.* 108.

“physical weakness”, “fear of the greatness of the subject”, and “difficulty of success”. In Aristides' quotation, the Pindaric words lose their original moral connotation (the achievement of ἀρετή), as of course we can judge from a more complete text (: 4 lines) of *fr. 108 (a)* cited by *epist. Socr.*

Asclepius was now in every way Aristides' instructor. Whole speeches were due to his agency. The following paragraph (3), is another good example of god's assistance: among other things he strengthened Aristides' confidence in the art of improvisation, a part of his profession in which he was professedly weak.¹³

Epistulae Socratis, 1.7 (p.610H.=11.6 Köhl)

The text of *Epistulae Socratis* is important in establishing the meaning intended by Pindar in *fr.108 (a)*. In a letter – the first in a group of seven –, occurs the earliest quotation of these lines. Socrates is imagined to be the writer of the letter, which is a reply to an invitation repeatedly sent by king Archelaos of Macedon for Socrates to visit his palace (§1).¹⁴

The author of the letter considers the Daimonion as a way of divine oracle through which Socrates describes what he has done and what he left.¹⁵

Epist. Socr. 1,7 Köhl. (Orelli 1)

(7) Πρὸς ἃ δὴ |
καὶ ἐμὲ ἔταξεν ὁ θεός. Ἐπεικῶς μὲν οὖν ἀπεχθάνεσθαι μοι | συμβαίνει ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 25
'Ἄλλ' ἐκείνος ἀφίστασθαι οὐκ ἔα, ᾧ | πειστέον μᾶλλον. Εἰκὸς γὰρ τό γε ὑγιὲς ἐμοῦ
κρεῖττον αὐτὸν | εἰδέναι· ἐπεὶ καὶ πρὸς σὲ βουλευομένῳ ἀπεῖπε μὴ ἰέναι καὶ τὸ |
δεύτερον πέμψαντός σου ἀπηγόρευσεν. Ἀπειθεῖν δὲ αὐτῷ ὀκνῶ | καὶ τὸν 5
Πίνδαρον ἡγούμενος εἰς τοῦτο εἶναι σοφόν, ὅς φησι· „Θεοῦ δὲ δείξαντος ἀρχὰν
ἕκαστον ἐν πράγῳ εὐθεῖα δὴ | κέλευθος ἀρετὰν ἐλεῖν, τελευταὶ τε καλλίονες.“ (= *Frgt. 108 a*)

Σχεδὸν γὰρ οὕτω που αὐτῷ ἔχει τὸ ὑπόρχημα. (8) Πολλὰ δὲ | καὶ
πολλοῖς τῶν ἄλλων εἴρηται ποιητῶν περὶ θεῶν καὶ ὅτι τὰ | μὲν κατὰ τὴν 10
τούτων βούλῃσιν πραττόμενα ἐπὶ τὸ λῶρον ἐκβαίνει, τὰ δὲ παρὰ θεὸν
ἀλυσιτελῆ ὑπάρχει τοῖς πράξεσιν.

epist. Socr. 1,7-8 (11,6 Köhl.)

Socrates expresses fear to oppose the god's advice, which he respects and commits himself not to infringe. He buttresses his argument on Pindar, whose words are

¹³. Cf. §46. Behr 1968a: 46 with n.21.

¹⁴. Köhler 1928: 92-3; Schering 1917: 40ff.

¹⁵. Köhler 1928: 92.

assumed to be wise. A deed can only be considered to be successful when it conforms with the god's will, and this is a safe practice. This point is clearly illustrated at §8, where views of other poets are epitomised: someone can gain profit when he acts according to divine βούλησις, whereas the opposite action is deprecated as ineffective ἀλυσιτελῆ.

The quotation from Pindar is followed by the sentence “Σχεδὸν γὰρ οὕτω που αὐτῷ ἔχει τὸ ὑπόρχημα”. This is an affectation that need not suggest non-verification of the passage. This turn of phrase in introducing a quotation is a Socratizing – Platonizing admission that the quote may not be exact, carrying also the implication that the focus of the citator's attention is on the substance of Pindar's words, since the precise wording does not matter.¹⁶

<i>Epist. Socr.</i> 1,7 Köhl.	Aristid. 27(16), 2, 125, 9K
„Θεοῦ δὲ δείξαντος ἀρχὰν ἕκαστον ἐν πρᾶγος εὐθεΐα δὴ κέλευθος ἀρετὰν ἐλεῖν, τελευταί τε καλλίονες.“	ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἔφη Πίνδαρος, θεοῦ δείξαντος ἀρχὴν οὐδὲν δὴ τὸ κωλύον.

A comparison of Aristides' testimony with that of *epist. Socr.*, indicates that they use the Pindaric quotation differently because they have different localized purposes:

1. In the text of *epist. Socr.* the will of the god is expressed as a piece of advice and as a prohibition, (cf. ἀπεῖπε ... ἀπηγόρευσεν), whereas in Aristides, it has the form of divine order (κελεύει).

2. In *epist.* Socrates expresses fear of transgressing the prohibition set by the god. On the other hand in *Or.* XXVII, the emphasis of Aristides' interpretation is on the abundant powers the god possesses in eliminating every obstacle in matters which seem to be absolutely hopeless. This possibility is a result of a long experience, and in this respect the quoted Pindaric words obtain a more personal tone.

Pind. *fr.* 108(a), like *Ol.* II.86-8, is quoted twice at the prooemia of the *Ors.* XXVII, and XXXIII. In *Or.* XXXIII. *Πρὸς τοὺς αἰτιωμένους ὅτι μὴ μελετῶν* –(dated almost a month after: late Sept. AD 166)– Aristides preserves a fuller version of Pindar's words.

¹⁶. Aristides employed similar turn of phrase in introducing quotes from Pindar: like οἶμαι λέγει. Cf. *Or.* XXIII.36.

III.4.2 Aristid. 33(51), 2, 228, 3K = Pind. Fr. 108a.

Introduction to *Or. XXXIII* (51) ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΙΤΙΩΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΟΤΙ ΜΗ ΜΕΛΕΤΩΙΗ¹⁷

After an interlude, where Aristides resumed his career on a full scale, in the summer of AD 165, he succumbed to smallpox when was staying on his estate in the suburbs of Smyrna.¹⁸ In the January of 166, he was afflicted with a second virulent infection.¹⁹ Despite the doctors' prognosis, he recovered with the help of Athena, Asclepius, Heracles, and other divinities.²⁰ At this time in late September AD 166, recuperating in retirement on his Laneion estate (Mysia), Aristides issued this apologetic oration in a form of a letter to a friend, perhaps the prophet Corus (§14), to justify his lengthy absence from Smyrna.²¹

In a moral tone similar to that of the passages from the time of the Cathedra, Aristides blames the lowness of popular taste, which preferred the descriptive declamations of contemporary sophists to his higher form of oratory. His art became something sacred, his rivals profaners and debasers of a pure art.

XXXIII. (51) ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΙΤΙΩΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΟΤΙ ΜΗ ΜΕΛΕΤΩΙΗ.

- 1 Οὐκ ἀμφοτέρων ἄρα τῶν καιρῶν διήμαρτον, εἴπερ χάριεν μὲν | ἦκοντα
ἐκ τῆς ἀποδημίας δέξασθαι καὶ προσειπεῖν, ἄλλως τε | καὶ ἀφ' ὧν συνευ-
ξάμεθα ἐπανήκοντα· εἴη δ' ἂν τι καὶ προπέμψαι | ἅμα τῷ μέλει· σὺ δὲ τοῦτον
ἦκειν τὸν καιρὸν ἀπέδωκας· ἐδεξάμεθα οὖν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς οὕτω
συνῆγεν. θεοῦ δὲ, φησὶν | Πίνδαρος (frg. 108 a), δείξαντος ἀρχὴν εὐθεΐα
2 δὴ κέλευθος ἐλεῖν | τὸ προκείμενον. καὶ δῆτα σοὶ μὲν πλεῖν [ἡμῖν] ἐξ οὐρίας 5
τε | καὶ ἐπὶ χρηστοῖς καὶ δευτέρων ἀμεινόνων ἀγγέλλεσθαι, ἡμῖν δ' αὖ τὰ |
ἡμέτερα ἐξ οὐρίας τε ἀγωνίζεσθαι καὶ 'ρόθιῳ κώπῃ' παρενεγκεῖν | ἅπαντας
"Ελληνας, ὅσον πλεῖστον ἔξεστιν, Ἀσκληπιός τε προστάτης | ἡμέτερος καὶ
Ζεὺς ὁ πάντα νέμειν κύριος παρέχοι διὰ τέλους. καὶ | ταῦτα μὲν δὴ ταῦτα. 10
μέτειμι δὲ ἐπὶ ἕτερον προοίμιον κατὰ Στησίχορον (frg. 241 PMG).

(Aristid. 33 (51) 2,227-28,3-5 K).

17. His well-known inability to speak impromptu is attested in a Philostratus' anecdote (VS 2.9.583), where Aristides protested to speak without advance notice before Marcus during his visit to Smyrna AD 176: οὐ γὰρ ἐσμέν τῶν ἐμούντων, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀκριβούντων. Cf. Pack 1947: 17; Boulanger 1923: 436.

18. The illness broke out in Cassius' army and then began to ravage the Roman empire. Cf. Behr 1968a: 96, n.8 and 166, n.13. See also Luc. *Alex.* 36; Galen 7. 279K; 10.363K.

19. Behr 1968a: 97 n.12.

20. The after-effects of the plague troubled the rest of his life. In *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).9, Aristides manifestly attributes his recovery to Asclepius and Athena through a dream recorded in *Hieros Logos* 2 (48).40-1. Aristides turns surprisingly to Heracles – probably under the influence of this illness –, to whom he delivers at this time a prose-hymn (*Or.* XL), where the god is honoured as a healer (§22).

21. On the circumstances, see Behr 1968a: 102-3, *id.* 1994: §4.

Aristides' context

While Aristides was recuperating on his estate at Laneion his Smyranean friend Corus arrived after a long journey. Aristides missed his arrival for which he was preparing the speech, and on the new occasion of his departure he had to rewrite it. A new preface is added and the whole speech is hastily revised for the occasion.²²

At paragraph (1), Aristides wants to commemorate the impending departure with a song (μέλος). Aristides appears here to want to compare the poet's role with that of the orator's. He may feel that his oratory can equally well express sentiments and describe joyful occasions that were traditionally considered as the subject of the poetry.²³

A month before, illustrating a personal experience, he quoted *fr.* 108 (a); the same fragment is quoted for a second time in the present oration, at the same place (proem §1), in order to illustrate another personal occasion.

Pindar' authority is explicitly verified in both quotations of *fr.* 108 (a), whereas there is no mention of the literary genre.

Pindar <i>Fr.</i> 108 (a)	Aristid. 33(51), 2, 228, 3K
θεοῦ δὲ δείξαντος ἀρχάν ἕκαστον ἐν πρᾶγος, εὐθεῖα δὴ κέλευθος ἀρετὰν ἐλεῖν, τελευταί τε καλλίονες.	θεοῦ δὲ, φησὶν Πίνδαρος, δείξαντος ἀρχὴν εὐθεῖα δὴ κέλευθος ἐλεῖν τὸ προκεί- μενον.

Aristides quoting here a fuller version than in *Or.* XXVII, changes and adapts deliberately Pindar's words into the context of the new occasion. He introduces the following alterations:

I. The expression ἕκαστον ἐν πρᾶγος is omitted to fit the occasion of the impending departure.²⁴ In fact it proves superfluous in Aristides' quotation, since the

²². Behr suggested a hasty revision for two reasons: *a.* the second preface (§§1-2), and *b.* the change in the number to the second person singular at §14.

²³. A similar idea is formulated in the peroration of his prose-hymn to *Heracles*: ὁ παρ' ἡμῶν λόγος ἀντ' ἄλλου μέλους ἡσμένους.

²⁴. The construction ἕκαστον ἐν πρᾶγος is also found elsewhere in *Pyth.* II.86, V.38, *fr.* 75.1. The use of ἐν *c. acc.* is local to Pindar's native Boeotian dialect. This use is in common to Pindar and Northwest Greek dialects (including Boeotian), cf. Buck 1954: §135,4, and in particular with Corinna, cf. *PMG* 654. iii. 20 ἐν δόμῳ βάντας.

emphasis of the Pindaric reference is on the opening line which sounds proverbial in effect.

2. Pindar talked about ἀρετάν.²⁵ Aristides omitted it as being out of his scope and replaced it by the expression τὸ προκείμενον. The ethical dimension of god's activity in Pindar disappears in Aristides' quotation.

3. The variant ἀρχήν probably represents a still later attempt, which Aristides also followed, to simplify and harmonise Doric forms with which his audience was unfamiliar. However, this variant occurs in both quotations of *fr.* 108 (a), and is easily explained by Aristides' technique concerning the dialectal simplification.

Over the next paragraph (2), Aristides offers his interpretation in which Pindar's words are connected with his personal circumstance. His text is imbued with religious overtones, since the quoted lines are intended as a prayer. Pindar's words are a kind of presupposition for a successful issue: ensuring divine 'succour' is essential for the success of the undertaken task. On this assumption the divine agents, Asclepius and Zeus are addressed together²⁶, and requested to grant his friend a successful trip (better than the first 'δευτέρων ἀμεινόνων'),²⁷ and to himself an equal success in refuting the charge that 'he does not declaim' (cf. §4). Employing legal vocabulary, Aristides calls his contest ἀντωμοσία and γραφή, and prays to surpass all the Greeks "with a foaming oar" (: a quotation from Eur. *IT* 407).²⁸

The Pindaric view on the omnipotence of the god serves Aristides as a basis for wider reflections. The quoted lines perform a double function in: formulating a praise that Aristides wants to use in his *propempticon* for the departure of his friend, and simultaneously to pray through them for the success of the impending trip and his rebuttal of the charge stated immediately after in paragraph (4).

²⁵. "achievement", "excellence", in later connotation means "perfection".

²⁶. For Aristides' conjunction of these deities cf. Behr 1968a: 158.

²⁷. A proverb included in 2nd century AD sophist Zenobius' *Epitome* (III, 15), "second attempts are better": παροιμία ἐπὶ τῶν θυομένων ἐκ δευτέρου, ὅταν αὐτοῖς τὰ πρότερον ἱερά μὴ καυθῇ καὶ ἐπὶ δεύτερα τραπῶσιν; cf. Diog. IV, 15; Apost. V, 88. This is a favourite proverb of Aristides who quotes it four times: (the proper form) in *Ors.* XX.23; XXVI.101, and (he makes a pun inverting its meaning) in *Ors.* XVIII.7; XXIV.59. Cf. also Pl. *Lg.* 723e1; *Lib. Ep.* 785, 937, 1521.

²⁸. Ἡ ῥοθίοις εἰλατίνας δικρότοισι κώπας ἐπλευσαν (: of the dash and sound of the oars), cf. *ib.* 1387 κώπαις ῥοθιά, *Hel.* 1452. Cf. A. *Pers.* 396, Hyp. *fr.* 157; also used metaphorically of an orator, Poll. 6. 147.

The after-effects of his illness along with his neurotic predisposition had as an unfortunate result the resumption of his religious fixation, which now becomes more persistent. In this context we can understand that the religious poetry of Pindar was for Aristides appropriate material for illustrating his intimate relation with his divine patrons. Furthermore, this quotation from Pindar illustrates his peculiar fusion of religion and rhetoric.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 108 (a) in *Ors.* XXVII, XXXIII

Aristides in both his quotations cites Pindar's words rather carelessly especially in transposing words and transcribing connectives. There is no indication in the context of both speeches that Aristides' argument demanded any sort of accuracy in citing Pindar, as was the case with his quotation of *Ol.* II.86-8 which was, as I have already discussed, relevant to Aristides' argument and accuracy in citing was more imperative. On the other hand, the quoted fragments function as an illustration of his personal relation with the god.

By Aristides' time the *Hyporchemes* of Pindar must have been favoured and broadly circulated, as we can judge from the references in ancient literature to this species of song of which Pindar was assumed to be chief master:

1. Athen. (p.15 D), states Pindar's distinction in composition of *Hyporchemes*: ὁ ὑπορχηματικὸς τρόπος, ὃς ἤνθησεν ἐπὶ Ξενοδήμου καὶ Πινδάρου.

2. These songs were known to Plutarch, *Quaest. Graec.* 9.15, p.748 B ὁ μάλιστα κατωρθωκέναι δόξας ἐν τοῖς ὑπορχήμασι (Plut. seems from the context to imply Pindar).

3. Clem. Alex. was familiar with the *hyporcheme fr.* 108 (b), and his testimony comes from a source other than Aristides', since he quotes other lines from this poem:²⁹

Clem. Alex. Strom. 5, 14, 101 (2, 393 St.)

Πάλιν τὸ δυνατόν ἐν πᾶσι προσάπτουσι καὶ οἱ παρ' Ἑλλήσι λογιώ- 61
τατοι τῷ θεῷ, ὁ μὲν Ἐπίχαρμος (Πυθαγόρειος δὲ ἦν) λέγων·
οὐδὲν ἐκφεύγει τὸ θεῖον· τοῦτο γινώσκειν σε δεῖ,

²⁹. Clement's list of quotations was repeated verbatim late by Eusebius *PE* 13,13,25 p.674b (II p.271 Gifford), and only Pindar's words by Theodoret. *Theol., Graecarum affectionum curatio*, 6, 25, 7.

αὐτός ἐσθ' ἀμῶν ἐπόπτης, ἀδυνατεῖ δὲ οὐδὲν θεός,

101 ὁ μελοποιὸς δέ·

θεῶν δὲ δυνατὸν ἐκ μελαίνας

νυκτὸς ἀμίαντον ὄρσαι φάος,

κελαινεφεί δὲ σκότει καλύψαι καθαρὸν

ἀμέρας σέλας

(ὁ μόνος ἡμέρας ἐνεστώσης νύκτα ποιῆσαι δυνάμενος [ποιῆσαι], φησὶν, θεὸς οὗτός ἐστιν), ἔν τε τοῖς Φαινομένοις ἐπιγραφομένοις Ἄρατος,

ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα εἰπών,

τὸν οὐδέποτ', ἄνδρες, ἐῷμεν

ἄρρητον·

Extracts from Pindar's *hyporcheme* were popular both with the public and the schoolmaster and presumably were widely known from various anthologies illustrating the god's omnipotence. Clemens appends in his text a series of quotations illustrating miraculous aspects and qualities of the god's power.

The quotation itself is inconclusive about Aristides' source.

If Aristides had known the following Pindaric lines he would have noticed that his quotation is incompatible with his own argument.³⁰

Aristides like Clement used anthologies. If Aristides had indeed read the whole poem, from which only *fr.* 108 (a) is preserved, he would have been in position to grasp the meaning that Pindar intended (the key in Pindar is the antithesis ἀρχή — τέλος). The fact that he gives to them a different interpretation is suggestive that he took them from an anthology, like Clement did. The disappearance of Pindar' ethical nuance of god's activity in Aristides' interpretation (cf. above), can easily be understood as the result of his reading the passage out of context.

³⁰. On the methodological implications cf. Introduction p.49.

**IV. *QUOTATIONS for ORNAMENTAL and
DECORATIVE purposes***

IV.1 Aristid. 26(14), 2, 91, 11K = Pind. Fr. 329.

Introduction to *Or. XXVI* (14) *ΕΙΣ ΠΩΜΗΝ*

The first trip that Aristides made to Rome in AD 144 had been a dismal failure. In AD 155 at the age of thirty-eight, he visited Rome for a second time and delivered in the presence of the Imperial court his speech *Εἰς Ῥώμην*, in which he glorified the whole Empire and the *Pax Romana*. In a euphoric tone, this oration gives a very impressive portrayal of the legal and social order and of the prosperity of Greco-Roman civilisation. To the educated people of the Imperial age, the city of Rome as being at the head of the empire which united civilised humanity, was at the core of their political and cultural consciousness.¹

Since the chronology of Aristides' life is confused, scholars disagree whether to date the speech in 144 (first trip to Rome) or 156, or some other date close to one of these.² Behr's date in late AD 155, has some weight on historical grounds.³

This speech has attracted many scholars, who approach it mainly as a source of contemporary political information.⁴ It can fairly be called the best cultural monument of the reign of Antoninus Pius,⁵ when such a peak of tranquillity and perhaps of general happiness was reached. There have also been some serious attempts to evaluate the *Roman Oration* as a monument of epideictic literature.⁶ Though full of rhetorical exaggeration, it does bring out many salient characteristics of the Roman empire.

Aristides' context

The purpose of a proem is to predispose the audience and to capture its interest for the subject of a speech. The need to impress the highly literate imperial court from the very beginning of his declamation is for Aristides a primary issue. The opening lines contain literary elements which show his virtuosity in handling poetry and prose for impressing the audience. Paragraphs 1-3 are moulded from two poetic quotations.⁷

1. See Dihle 1994: 232-3.

2. Boulanger (1923: 125, 461ff.), dates it in AD 144; whereas, Oliver (1953: 887), places it in AD 143.

3. The only datable event is found at §70. For Behr's date see 1968a: 88-9 n.92.

4. See Oliver 1953: 886-92; Dihle 1994: 232. Klein (1983: 122 n.149), is right in suggesting: "*die Reden der zweiten Sophistik bereits Hymnencharakter angenommen haben*".

5. Cf. the laudatory allusion §33 to the emperor.

6. Sieveking (1919: 62-5) correcting Mesk's views (1909), that it was modelled on the style of Isocrates, thinks of Demosthenes, whereas, Oliver (1953: 874), argues for the relationship with Plato. Cf. also Dihle 1994: 233.

7. Unlike any previous commentator, Oliver (1953: 874ff), argues for close dependence of Aristides' *Or. XXVI* on Plato's *Timaeus*, and the whole oration is to be regarded as a sort of cosmological hymn on a political theme modelled on *Timaeus*. The parallels are not strong enough to support Oliver's claim and it is doubtful – for Phillips (1954: 128) –, whether Aristides had a sincerely religious view of the Empire

Aristides probably expected his specially cultivated audience to recognise that the first of the quotations was surely Pindar's whose name was intentionally concealed.⁸ Thus, the audience is prepared from the prelude for a certain number of poetic turns. (Cf. in §3 the reference to Eros and to poetry in the famous line of Euripides).

He appears to express concern for his safety on the voyage, when he refers to a custom which was common among travellers to make vows before their journey.

XXVI. (14) ΕΙΣ ΡΩΜΗΝ.

- 1 Ἔθος τοῖς πλείουσι καὶ ὁδοιποροῦσιν εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι καθ' | ὧν ἂν 10
 ἕκαστος ἐπινοῇ· ποιητὴς μὲν οὖν ἤδη τις εἶπε σκώψας εὐξα|σθαι 'κατὰ
 χρυσόκερω λιβανωτοῦ', ἡμεῖς δέ, ὦ ἄνδρες, παρὰ τὴν | ὁδὸν τὴν ἐνταῦθα
 καὶ τὸν πλοῦν εὐχὴν ταύτην ἐποιησάμεθα, οὐκ | ἄμουσον οὐδ' ἐκμελῆ οὐδ'
 2 ἄπο τῆς τέχνης, εἰ σωθείημεν, προσ|ερεῖν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τὴν πόλιν. κατὰ
 ἰσομετρήτου μὲν οὖν εὐξα|σθαι τῇ πόλει λόγου οὐκ ἐνῆν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀληθῶς 1
 εὐχῆς αὐτὸ προσε|δεῖτο ἑτέρας· ἴσως μὲν [οὖν] καὶ μείζονος δυνηθῆναι τοιοῦτον
 ἄραι | λόγον, ὅστις παρισώσεται τοσῶδε ὄγκῳ πόλεως· προσερεῖν γε μὴν |
 ὑπεσχόμεθα, ὅπως ἂν δυνώμεθα, ἐπειδὴ γε καὶ ἄλλοι τὰ ἰσομέ|τρητα σφίσιν 5
 3 αὐτοῖς ἰσομέτρητα ποιοῦσιν αὐτὸ καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς. ἀλλ', | ὦ ἄνδρες, οἱ τῆς
 μεγάλης ἔνοικοι πόλεως, εἴ τι μέτεστιν ὑμῖν | προνοίας μὴ ἐμὲ ψεύσασθαι τὴν
 εὐχὴν, συνάρασθε τῷ τολμήματι, | ἵνα τῶν ἐγκωμίων πρῶτον ἀρχόμενοι
 καὶ τοῦτο ἔχωμεν λέγειν, ὅτι | εὐθύς μὲν τοιούτοις ἀνδράσιν ἐντυχεῖν ἦν, ὑφ'
 ὧν τις, 'κἂν ἄμουσος | ἦ τὸ πρὶν' κατ' Εὐριπίδην (frg. 663 N.²), ἐμμελής τε καὶ 10
 δεξιὸς | εὐθύς γίγνεται καὶ δύναιται λέγειν καὶ περὶ τῶν μειζόνων ἢ κατ' |
 αὐτόν·

(Aristid. 26 (14) 2,91-2,11 K).

The *Roman Oration* begins with an εὐχή, which is a vow to the god. Aristides hoped that the promise of a speech in praise of Rome would enlist the god's help in getting him safely to his destination.⁹ Eleven years earlier, in his first attempt to visit Rome, he was troubled by ill health. The rigours of the trip exacerbated his condition, and he reached Rome after lengthy delays desperately ill and totally unable to fulfil his

as an entity. Oliver points to *Tim.* 27c-d as a similar passage to Aristides' opening, arguing for certain allusions and echoes (see *infra* p.312, with ns.12 and 13).

⁸. The habit of claiming vague authorship is often observed in authors of Imperial Age. Aristides often conceals poet's name aiming to give to his quotation a more universal value and power; cf. *Ors.* XXVII.15 ποιητὴς ἂν εἴποι τις, XLI.4 ὥς φασιν.

⁹. *Ors.* XLIII and XLV were delivered in payment of a vow for being saved from a perilous sea-journey.

plans. All these are still clear in his mind, and he is particularly concerned to succeed in his aim, to declaim in the capital of the world.

The uniqueness of his vow is illustrated with a quotation from an unnamed poet,¹⁰ which serves as a foil to his own vow. His aim is to make a contrast between the stupid luxury of “golden-horned frankincense” and a manageable public address for which Aristides emphatically claims that his vow is οὐκ ἄμουσον οὐδ' ἐκμελῆ *i.e.* “not uncultured”,¹¹ nor “out of tune”.¹²

For those that are familiar with Pindaric fragments it is easily understood that the stilted expression ‘κατὰ χρυσόκερω λιβανωτοῦ’ is Pindar's.

In §2, Aristides calls for a second εὐχή;¹³ the titanic measure of Rome necessitates a second and perhaps greater vow. For him it is impossible to deliver such a speech which will equal the city's majesty and measure. This is a conventional topic of pleading magnitude of the theme.¹⁴ His real subject is not the city of Rome but the empire. To offer a worthy praise to the administrative and army policy of the famous *Pax Romana* under which civic life flourished in the whole empire, was indeed an unattainable target.¹⁵ Aristides knows well that oratory cannot reach every goal.

¹⁰. Klein 1983: 68 n.1. Klein points to Pl. *Alc.*2 149c as a parallel use of the custom.

¹¹. Aristides uses ἄμουσος often in similar effect: in *Or.* XXXII.3 he characterises the study of the oratory as οὐκ ἄμουσος διατριβὴ περὶ λόγους, in his correspondence with his teacher Alexander.

¹². This is a direct influence from Plato's *Critias*. In the proem of the dialogue, Timaeus remarks that his words are ἐκμελῆ. For similarities and influence from Plato see Oliver 1953: 885-6. However one should notice here the similarity of vocabulary with Plutarch's wording in *Lucull.* 1, 5 (ἦν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν χρεῖαν μόνην ἐκμελῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ πρόχειρος ὁ λόγος, καθάπερ ὁ τῶν ἄλλων τὴν μὲν ἀγορὰν θύννος βολαῖος πέλαγος ὥς διεστρόβει [*TGF* p.914N²], γενόμενος δὲ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐκτὸς αὐτοῦ, ἄμουσος τεθηπώς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐκμελῆ ταύτην καὶ λεγομένην ἐλευθέριον ἐπὶ τῷ καλῷ προσεποιεῖτο παιδείαν ἔτι καὶ μεῖράκιον ὦν), as well as in schol. Eur. (*Vita-argument.*, schPh. 791 ἐκμελῆ καὶ ἄμουσον).

¹³. The verbal reiteration of εὐχή and εὐχομαι is paralleled by Oliver (1953: 885), to Plato's word-play in *Tim.*, on ἀρχή and ἀρχομαι. Cf. the double prayer in D. *de coron. init.*: 1.1 Πρῶτον μὲν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοῖς θεοῖς εὐχομαι πᾶσι καὶ πάσαις; and 8.3 βούλομαι πάλιν τοὺς θεοὺς παρακαλέσαι, καὶ ... εὐχομαι.

¹⁴. It was customary since the classical times for some orators to make excuses in their introductions for the speeches which they are about to deliver, alleging that it is difficult to find words to match the greatness of their theme (cf. Aristid. *Or.* XXX.11), or that their preparation has been on the spur of the moment. This is done by: [Lys.] *Epit.* 1, Hyp. *Epit.* 2, and Isoc. *Panath.* 36-8. Isocrates (IV.13), spurns these conventional disclaimers addressing a discriminating audience in a new demanding style. An imitation of this view is attempted by the anonymous panegyrist of *Or.* XXXV *Eis βασιλέα*, who in §2, refers to these customary claims. These disclaimers are not seriously meant; on that see Norden 1974: vol.II. 595, n.1.

¹⁵. Cf. the interpretation in Oliver 1953: 908.

In §3, Aristides makes a compliment to his special audience: the quality of the men that comprise such an audience, is the best guarantee for a successful speech. Aristides' praise is couched in highly flattering terms through a quotation from Euripides. The point is if ever one was formerly 'uncultured' he can immediately become an adroit speaker (ἐμμελής and δεξιός), when he has to address such a qualitative audience. He may receive the power to speak even on themes which are greater than his talents.

This is a famous quotation from Euripides *fr.* 663N² (Σθενεβοία), "it seems that Eros teaches a poet even if there is no music in him before"; in what context this was said, is not known.

Eur. Σθενεβοία (*fr.* 663N²)

ποιητὴν δ' ἄρα
Ἔρως διδάσκει, κἄν ἄμουσος ᾗ τὸ πρὶν.

- I. Ar. V. 1074 ῥαδίως ἐγὼ διδάξω, κἄν ἄμουσος ᾗ τὸ πρὶν; schol. Ar. V. 1074a ὁ στίχος Εὐριπίδου ἐκ Σθενεβοίας.
 II. Plut. *quaest. conviv.* 1, 5, 1 p.622C ΠΡΟΒΛΗΜΑ Ε: Πῶς εἴρηται τὸ (Eur. fr. 663) 'ποιητὴν δ' ἄρα Ἔρως διδάσκει, κἄν ἄμουσος ᾗ τὸ πρὶν', ἐζητεῖτο.
 III. Plut. *de Pyth. or.* 23 p.405F ὁ δ' Εὐριπίδης εἰπὼν (fr. 663) ὡς 'Ἔρως ποιητὴν διδάσκει, κἄν ἄμουσος ᾗ τὸ πρὶν', ἐνενόησεν, ὅτι ποιητικὴν καὶ μουσικὴν Ἔρως δύναμιν — κινεῖ.
 IV. Plut. *amat.* 17 p.762B καίπερ ὧν ἐρωτικὸς ὁ Εὐριπίδης (fr. 663), τὸ σμικρότατον ἀπεθαύμασεν εἰπὼν 'ποιητὴν ἄρα Ἔρως διδάσκει, κἄν ἄμουσος ᾗ τὸ πρὶν.'
 V. Pl. *Smp.* 196e.2 πᾶς γοῦν ποιητὴς γίγνεται, κἄν ἄμουσος ᾗ τὸ πρὶν, οὐ ἂν Ἔρως ἄφηται.
 VI. Nic. *Epigr.* (fr. 566) in *Argum. Theoc. Id.* 11.
 VII. Aristid. 26 (14) 2,92,9-10 K.
 VIII. Aristid. 41 (4) 2,333,7 K.
 IX. Longin. *de subl.* 39. 2.

The line was first cited in Pl. *Smp.* 196e, in the speech of Agathon. Plutarch shows a specific preference quoting it three times. Aristides seems to be familiar with the Euripidean line: the same quotation is cited also *Or.* XLI.11 [*sc.* Διόνυσος] ποιεῖ χορευτὴν, 'κἄν ἄμουσος ᾗ τὸ πρὶν'.¹⁶

A good impression on the highly literate imperial court is for Aristides a matter of fundamental importance and his quotations from Euripides and Pindar are intended to fulfil this rhetorical purpose.

¹⁶. In *Or.* XXIV.55, Aristides uses ἀμούσως metaphorically for the attitude of the Rhodians.

Pindar Fr. 329

From the extant testimonies it becomes clear that Pindar in a poem, in which a ritual custom was described, referred ironically to a rich Thessalian man who is mocked for a stupid vow he made to Apollo.

It was an ancient practice to gild the horns of the sacrificial animal. Homer (*Od.* 3.432-8), describes the gilding process representing a metal-worker, who lays 'gold-leaf' on animals' horns with a hammer.¹⁷

Frankincense was of course a separate element in the sacrifice, where it was customary to smear the animal with frankincense and myrrh,¹⁸ or barley. Pindar drawing on Homer's tradition for that custom, transferred the epithet "golden-horned" to frankincense.

FR. 329

κατὰ χρυσόκερω λιβανωτοῦ

I. Aristid. 26 (14) 2,91,11 K.

II. schol. cod. Paris. 2995 (B. Keil, *Herm.* 48, 1913,319) ὁ Πίνδαρος διασύρων τινὰ πλούσιον ὡς ἄγαν τρυφῶντα τοῦτο εἶπεν, ἐντεῦθεν δεικνύς αὐτόν, ὅτι καὶ ἐν ταῖς πρὸς θεοὺς εὐχαῖς βλακεία ἐχρήτο (= CAF 3, 546 nr.784 Kock).

III. Porphy. *de abst.* 2, 15 τὸ δὲ εὐδάπανον καὶ εὐπόριστον πρὸς συνεχῇ εὐσέβειαν συντελεῖ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀπάντων. καὶ μαρτυρεῖ γέ ἡ πείρα ὅτι χαίρουσιν τούτῳ οἱ θεοὶ ἢ τῷ πολυδαπάνῳ. οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε τοῦ Θετταλοῦ ἐκείνου <τοῦ> τοὺς χρυσόκερω βούς καὶ τὰς ἐκατόμβας τῷ Πυθίῳ προσάγοντος μᾶλλον ἐφησεν ἡ Πυθία τὸν Ἑρμιονέα κεχαρίσθαι θύσαντα τῶν ψαιστῶν ἐκ τοῦ πηριδίου τοῖς τριῶν δακτύλοις.

329 ad fr. 277/78 trahit Schr.

This formerly unacknowledged quote was first credited to Pindar in modern times by Bruno Keil in *Hermes* in 1913.¹⁹ The quotation was erroneously included in Kock's edition²⁰ (CAF III Anon. 784K εὐξασθαι κατὰ χρυσόκερω λιβανωτοῦ), and wrongly attributed to comedy as Aristophanes fr. 913K.

A scholium in *Parisinus graecus* 2995 (14th to 15th century),²¹ explicitly attributes the fragment to Pindar. This testimony gives Keil strong grounds for believing

¹⁷. *Od.* 3.436-8 γέρων δ' ἱππηλάτα Νέστωρ χρυσὸν ἔδωχ'· ὁ δ' ἔπειτα βοὸς κέρασιν περίχευεν ἀσκήσας, ἴν' ἄγαλμα θεᾷ κεχάροίτο ἰδοῦσα. See Hainsworth 1993: 184; cf. *Od.* 3.384; *Il.* 10.294; Aeschin. *In Ctesiph.*, 164. 9 χρυσόκερων ἀποκαλῶν. Cf. *IG* I (3), 78, a, 40 (c422a?) βον χρυσόκερον.

¹⁸. Cf. Suid. s.v. Ἀθηναῖος: ...καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ὁ Ἀκραγαντίνος, ... Ὀλύμπια νικήσας, ἐκ λιβανωτοῦ καὶ σμύρνης καὶ τῶν πολυτελῶν ἀρωμάτων βοῦν ἀναπλάσας διένειμε τοῖς εἰς τὴν πανήγυριν ἀπαντήσασιν. The gum of the tree λίβανος used to burn it sacrifices: Hdt. I. 183, 2. 40. 86; Ar. *Nu.* 426, V. 96; *ID* (Delos) 2, [372] doc. 442, A, 190(179a).

¹⁹. Even in 1953: 908 Oliver in his commentary disregarded Pindar's authorship of the fragment.

²⁰. Probably misled by Aristides' σκώψας.

²¹. Contains *Or.* XXVI together with 24 other speeches. On the scholium to *Or.* XXVI.1, cf. Keil 1913: 319ff.

Pindar to be the author of the quote. In *Or.* XXVII.15 of the same Ms., this scholium erroneously credits a verse (: *TGF* adesp. 162 N = A. fr.272 Sidgwick) to Dionysius Periegetes.²² However, the mode of the quotation in Aristides and his predilection in introducing extracts from Pindar at the beginning of his *Ors.* XVII.3; XXVII.2; XXXIII.1; XXXIV.5; XXXVII.6; XLI.6; XLV.3, renders Pindar's authorship certain.

Further confirmation comes from Porphyrius, a century later than Aristides. His information that the rich man was a Thessalian (*de abstin.* 2, 15), suggests that Pindar's line was widely known in late antiquity, probably as anecdote, and that Porphyrius' source was different from Aristides' tradition.

The source for Pind. Fr.329

It is clear that Aristides did some research in collecting material for the various comparisons of the Roman empire with others (*e.g.* the Persian Empire in particular), and he seems to have consulted a number of historical sources, direct from the authors' text.²³

The quotation from Pindar as we have argued was extensively circulated as an anecdote in the 2nd and 3rd century AD, (cf. the scholium in *Parisinus graecus* 2995 and Porphyrius *de abstin.* 2, 15).²⁴

The fact that Aristides does not show any knowledge of the original context, suggests the probability that he cited Pindar's words, either from a list of quotes that he culled for personal use, or from a compilation of vows, in which various offers to the gods were recorded along with [extraordinary] ritual customs.

The practice of gilding an animal's horns as part of a dedication was in use in Hellenistic and Imperial times, as we can infer from the extant literary references to that custom:

²². Similarly a scholium in *Parisinus graecus* 3005 credits a line to Eupolis which Aristides thought was by Cratinus fr. 306K. Behr (*Aristides* 1981: vol.II.385 n.135), argues for the value of the scholia in these inferior Mss.

²³. Oliver (1953: 893-5), has showed that the reading of Polybius, Ctesias and Diodorus was surely part of his research into the subject of Rome. For the adverse criticism of Athens he drew on Anaximenes of Lampsacus, whereas Theopompus is actually mentioned in §51. From paragraphs 30 and 75 is clear that he used also Posidonius. He also seems to have consulted the source of Trogus on the Diadochs (Timagenes). It is also noteworthy that Aristides ignores all Rome's early history.

²⁴. Porphyrius may have taken his quotation on a Thessalian rich man from Thphr. *de pietat.*, fr. 7.48, from where it is repeated verbatim: οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε τοῦ Θετταλοῦ ἐκείνου <τοῦ> τοῦς χρυσόκερως βοῦς καὶ τὰς ἐκατόμβας τῷ Πυθίῳ προσάγοντος.

a. *Plut. reg. et imp. apophth.* 2 p.184E [*sc.* Antiochus] ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύρους χρυσόκερως παρασκευασάμενος καὶ θυμιαμάτων καὶ ἄρωμάτων πλῆθος ἄχρι τῶν πυλῶν ἐπόμεπυσε; (repeated in Posidon. *Phil. fr.*132.3).

b. *J. AJ* 13, 242 Ἀντίοχος ... εἰσέπεμψε μεγαλοπρεπῆ, ταύρους χρυσοκέρωτας καὶ μεστὰ παντοίων ἄρωμάτων ἐκπώματα χρύσεά τε καὶ ἀργύρεα; cf. *Const. Porph. de virtut.* 1, 79.

c. *Ath.* 5, 33 ταῦροι διήλθον δισχίλιοι ὁμοιοχρώματοι χρυσόκερως;

d. The lemma 'Κάσιον ὄρος' in *Suda* requires some notice:

πρὸς τῷ Εὐφράτῃ. καὶ Κάσιος Ζεὺς· ἔνθα Τραιανὸς ἀνέθηκε κρατῆρας ἀργυροῦς καὶ κέρας βοῦς παμμέγεθες κεχρυσωμένον, ἀκροθίνια τῆς κατὰ Γετῶν νίκης. καὶ ἐπιγράμματα ἐν τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν Ἀδριανῷ πεποιημένα· Ζηνὶ τὰδ' Αἰνεάδης Κασίῳ Τραιανὸς ἄγαλμα, κοίρανος ἀνθρώπων κοιράνῳ ἀθανάτων ἀνθετο.

The lexicographer quotes from the epigram written by Hadrian (*AP* 6.332). From the evidence of the epigram and of the heading recorded in *P* (Ἀδριανοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν),²⁵ Page argues that Trajan dedicated to Zeus on Mount Kasios the 'former' spoils of his victory over the Dacians (*Getae* in the epigram), and Hadrian (a *legatus* in his army [*vit. Hadr.* 4.1]), composed seven years later the epigram for Trajan on the eve of his Parthian campaign.

ΑΔΡΙΑΝΟΥ (*AP* 6.332)

	Ζηνὶ τόδ' Αἰνεάδης Κασίῳ Τραιανὸς ἄγαλμα,	
	κοίρανος ἀνθρώπων κοιράνῳ ἀθανάτων,	
	ἀνθετο, δοιὰ δέπια πολυδαίδαλα καὶ βοῦς οὔρου	
	ἀσκητὸν χρυσῷ παμφανόωντι κέρας,	2115
5	ἔξαιτα προτέρης ἀπὸ ληίδος, ἦμος ἀτειρὴς	
	πέρσεν ὑπερθύμους ὦι ὑπὸ δουρὶ Γέτας.	
	ἀλλὰ σύ οἱ καὶ τήνδε, κελαινεφές, ἐγγυάλισον	
	κρῆναι ἐυκλειῶς δῆριν Ἀχαιμενίην,	
	ὄφρα τοι εἰσορόωντι διάνδιχα θυμὸν ἰαίνῃ	2120
10	δοιὰ, τὰ μὲν Γετέων σκῦλα, τὰ δ' Ἀρσακίδεων.	

Trajan's offerings described by Hadrian are two goblets (δέπια) and the gilded bull's horns:

- i. δοιὰ δέπια πολυδαίδαλα, (twofold goblets worked with great art)
- ii. χρυσῷ παμφανόωντι κέρας.²⁶

²⁵ *Suda* agrees here and this is for *Page* (1981: 561), an independent confirmation, since *Suda* regularly shows no knowledge of the headings in *P*. The source of *Suda* here is thought to be *Arrian (Parthicorum fragmenta, fr. 36)*.

²⁶ Cf. *Suid. s.v. Κέμας*: ...θύσε χρυσόκερων κεμάδα; cf. *ibid.* 'Λῖτα' and 'Οὔρος', *AP* 6.231; 5.16.

IV.2 Aristid. 20(21), 2, 22,10K. = Pind. Fr. 75,14.

Introduction to *Or. XX* (21) ΠΑΛΙΝΩΙΔΙΑ ΕΠΙ ΣΜΥΡΝΗ

Among Aristides' extant works there are five speeches –standing in chronological order as originally published¹ – concerning the city of Smyrna². The *Παλινωδία ἐπὶ Σμύρνῃ* is intimately connected –as well as *Ors. XVIII* and *XIX*– to the earthquake and its aftermath, containing references both to the generous response of the emperors to Smyrna's plight and to the process of rebuilding and reconstruction. Aristides sent this speech from Laneion to the Provincial Assembly in Smyrna to celebrate the rebuilding of the city.³

Aristides' context

In this speech Aristides attempts to illustrate the image of Smyrna which had stood as an example of beauty (§14) through the most important periods of its history. The city was saved thanks to the emperors' goodwill, who becoming ambassadors to the Roman Senate on its behalf, erased every sorrow and misfortune. All the Greek world and the races of Asia displayed a common zeal and enthusiasm in the restoration of Smyrna (§16-8).

Aristides here paraphrases a verse from Sophocles, which became a proverb (*fr.* 667N² ἀνδρὸς κακῶς πράσσοντος ἐκποδῶν φίλοι), to stress that so great was the interest shown that:

(12) “*in respect to this city alone that ancient saying has been proved false: when men fare badly they are forgotten by their friends*”.⁴

The fortune of the city now has been changed completely and all the grief has gone away (§19): λευχειμονεῖ δὲ ἡ ἡπειρος, πανηγυρίζει δ' ἡ Ἑλλάς. The rejuvenation of the city is compared to Jason's rejuvenation from Medea's hands,⁵ and to the phoenix which resurrected itself.⁶

¹. Cf. Burton 1992: 444.

². *Ors.* XVII-XXI.

³. The Assembly met here this year, cf. Behr 1968a: 112-3. Cf. p.153 for an introduction to *Or.* XI.

⁴. Cf. schol. *ad loc.* Σοφοκλέους δὲ ἐν Οἰδίποδι τοῦτο εἰς παροιμίαν ἐπεκράτησε. Cf. *Or.* I.60.

⁵. Cf. the *hypothesis* to Eur. *Med.* and A. *Διονύσου Τροφοί*. Aristides employs the same story in *Or.* XXI.10.

⁶. In *Or.* XVII.2 Smyrna having being rebuilt three times is compared to the phoenix.

The themes of the “restoration” and the “present state” of the city are treated in (§§20-3):

XX. (21) ΠΑΛΙΝΩΙΔΙΑ ΕΠΙ ΣΜΥΡΝΗΙ.

20 πάντα δ' ὥσπερ ὁδῶ κεχωρηκέναι φαίνεται. Θησέως |
 μὲν γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς οἰκίσαντος, Ἀλέξανδρος ὕστερον εἰς τοῦτο τὸ | σχῆμα 5
 προήγαγεν· τρίτη δὲ χεὶρ τῶν πάντα νικῶντων ἀνίστησι τὴν | αὐτὴν καὶ
 συντίθησι· μεταθεῖναι μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἤξιωσαν, ἔρωτι τῆς | ὑπαρχούσης, οἱ δ'
 ἐπὶ τῶν ἰχνῶν ἐγείρουσιν. ἐπόθει δ' ἄρα καὶ ἡ | τῆς πόλεως φύσις οἰκιστὰς
 21 διττοὺς, δύο τὰς ἀρχηγέτιδας νέμουσα. | καὶ δὴ λιμένες τε κομίζονται τὰς τῆς
 φιλτάτης πόλεως ἀγκάλας | καὶ πάλιν [αὖ] κατακοσμεῖται, καὶ τῷ Μέλητι
 οὐδὲν ἐμποδῶν τὸ | μὴ τοὺς προσοίκους ἔχειν, ἦρος δὲ πύλαι καὶ θέρους 10
 ὑπὸ στεφάνων | ἀνοίγνυνται, χοροὶ δὲ Νυμφῶν καὶ Μουσῶν ἐν αὐτῇ
 22 τε καὶ περὶ | αὐτὴν χορεύουσι, ζέφυροι δὲ οὐ λυπήσουσι πνέοντες. ὦ
 μακάριοι | μὲν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων οἱ πρὸς ταύτην ἀφιζόμενοι τὴν ἡμέραν, ἐν |
 ἣ τὴν Σμύρναν ὄψονται τὸν ἑαυτῆς ἔχουσαν κόσμον· παῖδες δὲ | οὐδὲν 15
 ζημιωσόμενοι, ἀλλ' ὀψόμενοι τὴν πατρίδα οἷαν οἱ γονεῖς | ὥκουν· οἱ δ' ἐν
 ἡλικίᾳ τὰ μὲν συμπράξαντές τε καὶ συμπονήσαντες, | τὰ δὲ συνθύσοντες καὶ
 συνεορτάσοντες ἑαυτοῖς τε καὶ τοῖς εἰσαφικνουμένοις, ὥς τῶν παρόντων
 ἀγαθῶν ἔτι καλλίους αἱ τῶν μελλόντων ἐλπίδες.

(*Aristid. 20 (21) 2,22,10 K*).

Aristides wants to celebrate the generous response of Marcus and Commodus, placing them next to the names of Smyrna's original founders Theseus and Alexander.

In this passage Aristides illustrates the circumstances prevailing in Smyrna. The process of rebuilding and reconstruction is apparently well under way, if not complete.⁷

In (§21) Smyrna is depicted in the time of spring and summer. The renewed splendour and the rebuilt Smyrna, which can now be deemed superior to its former state, is praised by means of favourable description or epithets (κατακοσμεῖται, πύλαι... ὑπὸ στεφάνων ἀνοίγνυνται), by use of poetic vocabulary (χοροὶ Νυμφῶν καὶ Μουσῶν) and, by reference to the current historical circumstances (Μέλητι οὐδὲν ἐμποδῶν... ἔχειν).

⁷. See §§21-3 (reconstruction).

(21) “ In spring and summer the city's gates are opened, decked with crowns of flowers. The choruses of Nymphs and Muses dance in the city and about it. The breeze of the west winds will cause no pain”.

Aristides presents Smyrna in a state of festivity and the whole description bears a strong resemblance to the occasion (City Dionysia)⁸ Pindar describes in his dithyramb to Athens of which the preserved *fr.* 75 is the beginning. Pindar's festive vocabulary (ιοδέτων...στεφάνων 6), his references to related deities (Ὠρᾶν 14) and ritual procedures he describes (χοροὶ 19, ὁμφαὶ μελέων 18), recur in Aristides' text.

Keil in his *apparatus* and the Teubner editors of Pindar in their *index fontium* trace behind Aristides' sentence a reference to Pindar's *fr.* 75.

Pindar *Fr.* 75.14

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣ (B' cl. v. 8)

φοινικοεάνων ὀπότ' οἰχθέντος Ὠρᾶν θαλάμου
εὐοδμον ἐπάγοισιν ἔαρ φυτὰ νεκτάρεια.
τότε βάλλεται, τότ' ἐπ' ἀμβρόταν χθόν' ἐραταί
ἴων φόβαι, ρόδα τε κόμαισι μείγνυται,
ἀχρεῖ τ' ὁμφαὶ μελέων σὺν αὐλοῖς,
οἰχνεῖ τε Σεμέλαν ἐλικάμπυκα χοροί.

15

(*fr.* 75.13-9).

The dithyramb is preserved by later Greek writers and commentators in sufficient length to provide a substantive poem.⁹ The opening lines are preserved by Dionysius of Halicarnassus as an example of the austere style¹⁰ (*Comp.* 22), without giving a title.¹¹ Lines 1-9 are an invitation to the Olympian gods to grace Athens, which is favourably described. After focusing on Dionysus, Pindar in *ll.* 13-9 describes the springtime,¹² and a resurrection of the earth in the spring is suggested in *ll.* 14-7.

According to Pindar's account, the Seasons are living in their chamber (Ὠρᾶν θαλάμου 14) and when it opens, the sweet-smelling spring (εὐοδμον... ἔαρ 16-7) comes and all nature is transformed. This image of “spring-coming” is echoed in Aristides' text. He

⁸. Lines 6, 14 and 15 suggest a Dionysiac festival. **van der Weiden** (1991: 28) and **Kirkwood** (1982: 327) suppose the Great Dionysia; but cf. **Hooker's** opposed view (1957: 35-6): Anthesteria.

⁹. P.Oxy. 2438.9-10 refers to an Athenian dithyramb which brought Pindar a victory in 497/496 BC. However, it is uncertain if *fr.* 75 forms part of that dithyramb. See **van der Weiden** (1991: 187), a discussion of other attempts to assign a date.

¹⁰. For its characteristics cf. *Comp.* 22, 148ff. For an extensive résumé of *Comp.* 22, see **Pohl** 1968; **Grube** 1965: 220.

¹¹. Quotations to Bacchylides' dithyrambs is done by titles; one might expect the same for Pindar.

¹². Cf. *frs.* 70c.19; 70d[c].2-3? For this description of the spring time as an argument for the City Dionysia as the festival of performance, see **Puech** 1923: 151; and **Groningen** 1955: 192.

depicts the reconstructed Smyrna in the time of spring and summer when all the nature is renewed, to show an equivalent revival of the city.

In Pindar's text, the state of nature prompted by the advent of spring decorates itself with flowers, as does the city of Smyrna after its rebuilding. The language employed by Aristides about the opening of Smyrna's gates (§21), bears resemblance to Pindar's *Il.* 14-5; in both accounts the resurgence of the nature and rejuvenation of the city (Athens-Smyrna) is emphasised.

Aristides speaks of the city's gates which open in spring and summer –(extending Pindar's *ἔαρ* to summer as well, to show duration)—¹³ decked with *στεφάνων*. We should take this as a reference to Pindar's *ἰοδέτων στεφάνων* of which the gods are invited to take their share (*λάχεται στεφάνων*). In the dithyramb Athens is also decked with flowers (*ἴων φόβαι*) and the Athenians decorate their city and themselves¹⁴ with violets and roses.¹⁵

In both texts the word *ἔαρ* is preserved. The spring in Pindar is characterised *εὐοδμον* meaning “sweet-smelling”, a standard epithet of spring.¹⁶

Nevertheless, Aristides employs Pindar's imagery for the spring-coming with more freedom, introducing two deliberate alterations:

1. Aristides quoting *fr.* 75.14 does not preserve Pindar's expression *φοινικοεάνων* *όπότ' οἰχθέντος ὤρᾱν θαλάμου* but he speaks of the city's gates being opened (*πύλαι... ἀνοίγνυνται*). He embellishes his praise of Smyrna with Pindar's description of Athens in spring, but adapts it to his context. What he preserves is the main idea of Pindar, which now is expanded to suit his praise.

Aristides' intention is to purge Pindar's style of ‘*great*’ and ‘*spacious words*’ (*:φοινικοεάνων* 14; *οἰχθέντος* 14; *εὐοδμον* 15), which according to Dionysius of

¹³. Cf. Alc. *fr.* 296b, 3-4 Voigt, who talks about the gates of spring *ὡς γὰρ ὁκέϊ [γ]οντ' ἔαρος πύλαι | ἀμβρ οσίας ὁσδόμενοι [.] αἰς ὑπαμε [.]*.

¹⁴. Cf. Ath. 11.464f.

¹⁵. The altars of gods in Dionysiac festivals; see van der Weiden 1991: *ad loc.* and Cook 1900: 5-6.

¹⁶. van der Weiden 1991: *ad loc.*, understands *εὐοδμον* as predicative: “it seems that the smell is the result of just these nectareous plants”. For the spring in Greece see Irwin 1984: 152 and n.24.

Halicarnassus is characteristic of the “*austere style*” (αὐστηρὰ ἁρμονία).¹⁷ Dionysius argues that the difficulty of pronunciation of spacious and compound words makes them stand apart (*Comp.* 22. 148). Pindar's words in the form Aristides quoted them, are syntactically fairly regular: the words are mostly together, there are more connectives than in *fr.* 75, no irregularities in σχηματισμός, and no use of “difficult” letter combinations (οἰχθέντος).

2. In both texts choruses are attested. In the dithyramb choruses are presented approaching the diadem-wearing Semele (οἰχνεῖ... χοροί).¹⁸ Aristides introduces into his text Muses and Nymphs who join in common dances celebrating the rebuilt Smyrna, which we might count as a reference to *fr.* 75.19.

The image of Νύμφαι and Μούσαι must be of poetic origin. This assumption finds some support in *Or.* LIII.4, where Aristides remembered that the poets somehow are always bringing together the Nymphs and the Muses, and that Apollo is also called the chorus leader of the Muses, an obvious allusion to Pindar's *fr.* 94c Ὁ Μοισαγέτας με καλεῖ χιορεῦσαι [Ἄ]πόλλων[?].

(4) ἀνεμιμνησκόμην δὲ τῶν ποιητῶν, ὅτι Νύμφας καὶ Μούσας αἰεὶ πῶς συνάγουσι, καὶ τὸν Ἑρμῆν | ὡς χορηγὸν αὐτὸν προσαγορεύουσι τῶν Νυμφῶν, καὶ πάλιν γε Ἀπόλλωνα χορηγὸν Μουσῶν.

(Aristid. 53 (55) 2,469,9ff. K).

Thus, it is probable that Aristides in his conception of Smyrna's image in the spring drew on Pindar's *dithyramb*. The festal atmosphere of the Pindaric composition is clearly reflected and the conditions prevailing in Smyrna are similar to those in Athens. Furthermore, an attempted comparison between Athens and Smyrna in the time of spring may have assisted the rhetoric of Aristides' praise of the latter. His description of the festivity is supported by a subtle reference to the image of Athens included in Pindar's *dithyramb*.

¹⁷ D. H. discusses the word arrangement of *fr.* 75.1-8 in *Comp.* 22,155-62. He wants great and spacious words (22. 148): πολύβατον, πανδαίδαλος, ἰοδέτων, ἐαριδρόπων, κισσοδαῆ, ἐριβόαν, φοινικοεάνων, ἐλικάμπυκα; cf. Aristot. *rhet.* 1406b1 χρησιμωτάτη ἡ διπλὴ λέξις τοῖς διθυραμβοποιῶσι. With “*style*” D. H. denotes word and sound patterns; see Grube 1965: 220.

¹⁸ Grenfell and Hunt (1908: 88), suggest Selene.

It seems uncertain whether Pindar had also introduced choruses of Nymphs or Muses into the lost part of his dithyramb, dancing in Athens.¹⁹ If so, that might offer a model for Aristides for his praise, or we can suppose that Aristides was the first to combine Pindar's image with other poetic references to the mythological presence of the Muses and Nymphs, creating in that way a suitable festive atmosphere appropriate for his praise.

The source for Pind. Fr. 75

The dithyramb that Pindar composed for 'Αθηναῖοι appealed to Aristides. We may assume that Aristides had read Pindar's dithyramb in:

1. either in the works of Dionysius Halicarnassensis (*Comp.* 22) or from his personal notes which could contain a collection of extracts from various authors and poets praising important cities within the Greek world.
2. It is also possible that Aristides paraphrased the dithyramb in his school time (and later in *Ors.* XX and XLVI he reproduced parts of it in paraphrase).

Aristides does not quote Pindar *verbatim* but he only echoes *fr.* 75.14-9, embellishing his speech with very witty and indirect references to the dithyramb which describes the bursting out of spring in Athens. Although Aristides paraphrases freely Pindar's words, nevertheless his quotation succeeds in retaining an echo of the original. We cannot charge Aristides for lack of accuracy in citing, since his objective was to exploit Pindar's words as the background of his praise to Smyrna.

It is noteworthy that Aristides makes references neither to Pindar's authorship nor to the context of the dithyramb. His method of quotation fits better with the immediate context and the thematic development of the whole speech. Aristides presumably expected his audience to correlate Smyrna's festal appearance with the image of Athens in spring. In §§12-3, Aristides had compared Athens to Smyrna in a negative context as a city which experienced also hard circumstances (φυγάδα τὸν δῆμον γεννέσθαι). Now his intention

¹⁹ The connection of Nymphs with the Bacchic joy and especially with Dionysos is also known from S.OT 1108/9 Νυμφᾶν Ἑλικωπιδων, αἷς πλεῖστα συμπαίζει (sc. Διόνυσος). Cf. also Anacr. 2.2D (PMG 357).

is to make his fellow-citizens feel proud of their city, since it would be inappropriate for them to feel ashamed of the conditions prevailing in Smyrna after the earthquake, but the invincible efforts of the emperors have created a state of prosperity and affluence comparable to that of Athens.

IV.2 Aristid. 46(3), 2,370,8-10K. = Pind. Fr. 75,14.

Introduction to Or. XLVI. (2) *ΙΣΘΜΙΚΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΑ*

Aristides on his return from Rome spent some time in Corinth, where on the occasion of the festival of the Isthmus he delivered in summer AD 156 his *Ἰσθμικός εἰς Ποσειδῶνα*, an elaborate panegyric for Corinth.²⁰

Aristides, having treated in the preceding paragraphs themes relevant to Poseidon's mythology and the generosity he displayed for mankind (§§7-15), and places consecrated to him (§§16-9), dedicates a considerable part of his speech (§§20-31) to praise of Corinth.

Aristides' context

Among all the places favoured by Poseidon, Isthmus is the dearest and most honoured by him with a unique geographical position (§21), charm and glorious historical past (§§20-4). The land of Corinth even from earliest times was praised as “rich” by the poets.²¹ It is a kind of common market for all Greeks, a national festival (§23) and a kind of metropolis (§21).

Corinth's contemporary charms are extolled in (§25):

XLVI. (2) *ΙΣΘΜΙΚΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΠΟΣΕΙΔΩΝΑ.*

25 Ἀλλὰ δῆτα τοῦ κάλλους |
αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν ἡμέρων καὶ τῶν ἐρώτων τόσον ἐξῆπται τὸ πληθος, | ὥς 25
πάντας μὲν ἀναδήσασθαι τῷ ἡδεῖ, φλέγεσθαι τε ἅπαντας ἐπ' αὐτῇ ὁμοίως, 1
ἔχειν δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῇ φιλότητας, ἡμέρους, ὀριστύν, πάρ|φασιν, ὥς κλέψαι τὸν
νοῦν καὶ τῶν μέγα ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς φρονούν|των, καὶ εἰ δεῖ τι ἄλλο πρὸς τούτοις,
πάντα ὅσα λέγεται τῆς θεοῦ | φάρμακα, ὥς εἶναι σαφῶς τῆς Ἀφροδίτης τὴν
πόλιν, ἣν ἐμοὶ καὶ | ἐπονομάζειν ἔπεισιν ὅστις ποτὲ οὗτος ὁ κεστός ἐστιν, ᾧ 5
πάν|τας ἡ θεὸς ἀναδεῖται πρὸς ἑαυτήν, καὶ καθάπερ τινὰ ὄρμον καὶ |
περιδέραιον συμπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος τοῦτ' εἶναι, καὶ τέμενος | Νυμφῶν,
ναῖδων ἀπασῶν ἐνταυθοῖ ναουσῶν, καὶ θάλαμον ὤρων, | ᾧ πάντα τὸν
χρόνον ἐγκάθηνται καὶ ὅθεν προέρχονται ἀνοιγνῦσαι | τὰς πύλας 10
εἴτε Διὸς σύ γε βούλει καλεῖν εἴτε Ποσειδῶνος· εἰ δὲ | καὶ ἕρις ποτὲ περὶ

²⁰ The Isthmian games were founded in honour of Leucothea and Palaemon, whose mystery cult attracted Aristides, and he dedicated his last part of the speech to them. Cf. Behr 1968a: 90 with n.96.

²¹ Cf. *Il.* 2.570; *Ol.* XIII.4 ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον; Thucyd. I 13.6.

κάλλους ἐνέπεσε ταῖς πόλεσιν, ὥσπερ ταῖς | θεαῖς λέγεται ποτε γενέσθαι ἐν
ἀλλήλαις, μετὰ Ἀφροδίτης ἄν | ἦν.

(Aristid. 46 (3) 2,369-70,8-10 K)

Corinth is presented as the ‘*city of Aphrodite*’ having all the charms epic tradition attributes to the goddess (κάλλους, φιλότητας ἡμέρους ὁριστύν, πάρφασιν). Aristides, drawing on the episode of Zeus’ deception in *Iliad* (14.153-351), paraphrases two verses (216-7). So great is the abundance of beauty, desire, love and allurements which the city itself possesses as to steal the mind and to chain all men with pleasure as Aphrodite does. Hence he names Corinth *κεστός*: a charmed girdle.²²

In the second half of (§25), Corinth is credited with three characterisations from the mythological tradition:

1. The city is named ὄρμος (*pendant*) and περιδέρειον συμπάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος (*necklace of all Greece*). A reference to Hom. *hymn to Aphrodite* (V, VI) is traceable, from where Aristides borrows the noun ὄρμος.²³

2. τέμενος Νυμφῶν, ναΐδων ἀπασῶν ἐνταυθοῖ ναουσῶν: Corinth is described as “*precinct of the Nymphs*”, those youthful and beautiful nature-goddesses whom the Greeks believed to reside in particular natural phenomena.²⁴ The Greeks did not systematise their beliefs in these creatures, though certain broad classes were recognised,²⁵ from which Aristides chooses the Naiads (water-nymphs) who have Corinth as their dwelling and precinct. Since they were known for their amorous disposition and were credited with many love-affairs with gods and men, it was fitting for Aristides to incorporate them into his praise, stressing the charming appearance of Corinth. This might be an allusion to the fact that the city in antiquity was famous for its prostitution.

²². This “zone” is not a belt but a band or strap. On it are depicted the powers of love and desire which it controls.

²³. The ὄρμος was a chain which passed around the neck and hung down on the breast: cf. *h. Ven.* V.88; VI.10. The connection between this quotation with the one from *Iliad* is the presence of Aphrodite. Cf. Eust.1150,22. 1788.46.

²⁴. They are incidental rather than central to the myths. See **Grant-Hazel** s.v. *Nymphs*.

²⁵. Dryads, Hamadryads, Meliae, Oreads, Naiads, Nereids, Oceanids and others named after geographical features.

3. Corinth is also characterised as:

(25) θάλαμον ὤρων, ὥ πάντα τὸν χρόνον ἐγκάθηνται καὶ ὅθεν προέρχονται ἀνοιγνῦσαι τὰς πύλας εἴτε Διὸς σύ γε βούλει καλεῖν εἴτε Ποσειδῶνος·

“*The chamber of the Seasons*²⁶ where they forever sit and from which they come forth when they have opened the gates—whether you wish to call them the gates of Zeus or Poseidon”.

According to Pindar's account (l.14), Horai are presented as living in the chamber and when –as we pointed out before– it opens the sweet-smelling spring comes forth and all nature, prompted by the advent of spring, is transformed.

Aristides exploits in his Isthmian *oration* the Pindaric source, being at the same time eclectic. It was not part of Aristides' rhetorical agenda to preserve the details about the personality and appearance of the Horai, but to be selective choosing only ὤρων θαλάμου.²⁷

Aristides in quoting Pind. *fr.* 75.14, introduces certain alterations:

1. He omits the adjective φοινικοεάνων (*hapax*).²⁸ Pindar was the first to apply φοινικοέανος to the Horai. The epithet and other compounds with φοινικο— are used in connection with the spring.²⁹ We have noticed that Aristides' intention is to smooth out and simplify Pindar's wording.

2. The Horai in the *Isthmian oration* are employed in a different context. They did not bring the spring when they came forth from their chamber as in Pindar, but they controlled the gates of Isthmus which are attributed either to Zeus or to Poseidon.

On this point Aristides modifies Pindar's version, trying to combine two mythical narratives which are related with the gates of Corinthian Isthmus:

²⁶. They were three in number Eunomia, Dike, and Eirene. In *Th.* 901ff. they are daughters of Zeus and Themis; cf. Pind. *fr.* 30.6; *Pae.* I.6; *Pyth.* IX.60; Apollod. 1,3,1. They are customarily represented as three graceful girls, often holding a flower or plant. See *LIMC* vol.V 1.s.v. *HORAE*, 503-38.

²⁷. He uses the Attic form ὤρων (ὠρᾶν: Pind.) and unlike Pindar, Aristides prefix θαλάμου to ὠρᾶν.

²⁸. φοινικοέανος: purple-robed was restored by Koch 1851: 734.

²⁹. Cf. *Isth.* III/IV.36b; *Pyth.* IV.64; *fr.* 129.3.

a. Διὸς Πύλαι

In Homer (*Il.* 5.749-52) the Horai are entrusted with the entrance to Olympus.³⁰ They are the keepers of heaven's cloud-gates (cf. 8.393). The concept of the entrance to Olympus being guarded by gates formed out of clouds is a striking and original invention of the Homeric tradition.³¹ Πύλαι open αὐτόματα, 'of their own accord', but are under the general control of the Horai. Pindar's *fr.* 75.14 does not seem to agree with the Homeric description.

b. Ποσειδῶνος Πύλαι

Aristides here follows Pindar, who connects the Isthmus' πύλαι with the god Poseidon. Pindar in *Ol.* XIII illustrates Poseidon's affinity with the Isthmus and the city of Corinth:³²

OLYMPIA XIII (464)

τὰν ὀλβίαν Κόρινθον, Ἰσθμίου
πρόθυρον Ποτειδᾶνος, ἀγλαόκουρον·
(*Ol.* XIII.4-5).

5

The Isthmus is Poseidon's residence where he has his τέμενος. (Cf. *Nem.* VI.39-41: πόντου τε γέφυρ'... Ποσειδάνιον ἄν τέμενος).³³

Aristides quotes *fr.* 75.14 combining two mythical versions: (Pindar: *Poseidon* and Homer: *Zeus*), without saying which is the more authoritative. (εἴτε Διὸς σύ γε βούλει καλεῖν εἴτε Ποσειδῶνος).

The connection between *Ol.* XIII.4-5 and *Il.* 5.749-52 gives Aristides a chance to make the Corinthian citizens feel proud of their city

The combination of the *Horai* with the city of *Corinth* was not Aristides' invention, but we can identify behind it one more Pindaric pattern. Pindar was the first to associate the Seasons with Corinth (*Ol.* XIII.3-17). The Horai occupy a central position in the prelude of the ode and are presented as a political power which represents civil order

³⁰. See. Etym. Magn.s.v. "Ὥρα: Καὶ ὥραι αἱ πυλωροὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θεαί· παρὰ τὸ ὥρεῖν καὶ φυλάττειν.

³¹. See Kirk 1990: *ad loc.*

³². Cf. *Ol.* IX.86 Κόρινθου πύλαις (*i.e.* Isthmus); a standard expression for Κόρινθος. Cf. Hdt.V.52. ἐν Κόρινθου πύλαις. Cf. Pindar's variant in *Ol.* XIII.5 πρόθυρον Ποτειδᾶνος.

³³. Cf. Arist. Byz. *Ethnika*, s.v. ἰσθμός: ἐν ἡ Ἰσθμῖος ὁ Ποσειδῶν; cf. *Isth.* IV.37-8: ὁ κινητὴρ καὶ γέφυραν ποντιάδα πρὸ Κόρινθου τειχέων; cf. also *Isth.* I.32; *Nem.* V.37-39.

and justice³⁴ in Corinth (Εὐνόμεια, Εἰρήνη, Δίκη). The Horai have benefited the city with ἀγλαΐα 9 and the Corinthians are presented by Pindar as the recipients of their favours (ll.16-7).

Therefore, we can assume that when Aristides quotes θάλαμον Ὠρῶν in his Isthmian *oration*, he draws on Pindar's combination of Horai with Corinth.

Pind. Fr. 75.14 in Aristides' Ors. XLVI and XX

Aristides embellishes his speeches for Smyrna and Corinth with a small extract from Pindar *fr.* 75. In both speeches we have a Panegyric oration in honour of two important cities of the ancient Greek world.

Aristides exploits Pindar's dithyramb of Athens to decorate his praise, stressing the state of affluence and beauty common to Smyrna and Corinth.

According to the literary conventions of his praise, Aristides in the “*Smyrna's palinode*” (*Or.* XX) –using a more flowery language– preserves more details about the context of *fr.* 75 than he did 22 years earlier in his “*Isthmian oration*” (*Or.* XLVI), where only the reference to the chambers of seasons is preserved, followed by mythological explanation.

³⁴. Hesiod was the first to connect the Horai with political virtues (*Th.* 902-3). See Bowra 1961: 413-4; also Jalles 1913.

V. *UNCLASSIFIED QUOTATION*

V.1 Aristid. 36(48), 2, 298, 27-8K = Pind. Fr. 201.

Introduction to Or. XXXVI (48) ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΟΣ.

Aristides in AD 141 set out on a tour of Egypt; with Alexandria as the base of his operations, he travelled extensively proceeding as far south as the first cataract.¹

The answer to the question why the Nile rises at a time when other known rivers sink to their lowest level, attracted Aristides' attention during his stay in Egypt. Back in Smyrna, sometime between AD 147-149, he composed this treatise on the rising of the Nile.² Lengthy refutations of seven of the more current scientific explanations suggested on Nile's inundation, comprise the main corpus of the treatise.³ Aristides in his *peroratio* sees in God's providence the source of Nile, which is divine and unique.

Aristides' context

Aristides in the concluding part of his work (§§100-3), and having summarised the theories he discussed before, surprisingly reverts to Homer's allusions to the Nile.⁴ At paragraphs (111-3) attempting an evaluation of poets' testimony, he observes:

XXXVI. (48) ΑΙΓΥΠΤΙΟΣ.

112 ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ μύθους μὲν οἶμαι συνθεῖναι καὶ |
ποταμῶν καὶ πόλεων ὀνόματα ἀπαριθμῆσαι καὶ τοιαῦτα ποικίλ|λιν παντὸς
μᾶλλον ἴσασι τε καὶ διώκουσι, μάρτυρες δ' οὐχ ἱκανοὶ | περὶ τῶν οὕτως
ἐλέγχου δεομένων. αὐτίκα Πινδάρῳ πεποιήται, | ὅσπερ μάλιστ' ἀληθείας 25
ἀντέχεσθαι δοκεῖ τῶν ποιητῶν περὶ τὰς | ἱστορίας, καὶ οὐ πόρρωθεν, ἀλλ' ἐξ
αὐτῶν τῶν τόπων καὶ οὗτος | ὁ ἐλεγχος· φησὶ γὰρ 'Αἰγυπτίαν Μένδητα
113 παρὰ κρημνὸν θαλάσ|σας' (frg. 201, 1 B⁴). καίτοι οὔτε κρημνός ἐστιν
οὐδεὶς ἐκεῖ οὔτε | θάλαττα προσηχεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐν πεδίῳ πολλῷ καὶ κεχυμένῳ,
οὔπερ ὁ | Μενδήσιος ἅπας νομὸς οἰκεῖται καὶ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν, ἣν ὀνομάζου|σιν 1
Θμοῦιν, ὥστε μηδ' ὀφθαλμῷ καταλαβεῖν εἶναι μήτ' ἀπ' ἄκρων | ἐπὶ θάτερα
μήτ' ἐκ μέσου μηδ' ἐτέρωσε. ὁ δ' ἄρα Κιθαιρῶνος | καὶ Ἑλικῶνος πλέως ὦν
καὶ Φικίου ἄκρου πρὸς τὰ παρ' αὐτῷ | καὶ συνήθη κάκεῖνα τεκμαιρόμενος 5
μάλα ἐλευθέρως εἶπεν οὔτ' | ἰδὼν οὔτ' ἀκούσας σαφῶς, ποιήσας δὲ πρὸς τὸ
δόξαν αὐτῷ κατὰ | τὴν ἀρχαίαν τε καὶ ἐκ πατέρων τοῖς ποιηταῖς ὑπάρχου-

¹. Behr 1968a: 16-7.

². Cf. Behr 1968a: 19-21.

³. Aristotle or Theophrastus collected all the theories up to the end of the 4th cent. BC in three books. We possess its mutilated Latin version *Liber Aristotelis de inundacione Nili* (fr.248 Rose).

⁴. Aristotle quotes him in support of his argument that rain was the cause of the Nile's inundation. Cf. scholium to *Od.* 4. 477.

σαν περὶ | ταῦτα ἐξουσίαν. καὶ τί δὴ θαυμαστόν, εἰ περὶ ὧν μηδ' αὐτοὶ οἱ |
ἐπιχώριοι καὶ ταῦτα ὄντες Αἰγύπτιοι γιγνώσκουσι, περὶ τούτων | οἱ τοσοῦτ' 10
ἀπέχοντες ποιηταὶ μηδὲν ἰσχυρὸν ἔχουσι λέγειν;

(*Aristid.* 36 (48) 2,298,27-28 K).

Aristides considers the Egyptians themselves as trustworthy witnesses and informants of cult rituals, geographical details, and various natural phenomena.⁵ With reference to the poets he thinks that they describe landscape in a way which is unrealistic and corrects them in their treatment of geographical details. He attributes such their inaccuracies to the “*poetic licence*”,⁶ which poets claim as their privilege.

In a series of derogatory statements (§112), Aristides reflects the *communis opinio* that poets lack any accuracy and consequently are not satisfactory witnesses about matters needing such careful examination.

The orator criticises the poets' predilection for and technique of:

1. composing “μύθους” (the activity of the story-teller is considered in a pejorative sense),⁷
2. of enumerating the names of the rivers and cities, and
3. of using such embellishments: “ποικίλλειν”. (The term denotes variety and suspicion about the truthfulness of the subject).

Aristides here employs equivalent terms (μῦθος and ποικίλλειν) that Pindar used elaborating poetry's ability to lie:

a. **Μῦθοι**: The context shows that μῦθοι has a derogatory connotation, and this aspect of poetry is frequently mentioned. An allusion to Pindar's view on this topic is possible since the word occurs three times in plural form referring to the work of other poets and it has a negative connotation:⁸ *Ol.* I.29: δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις

⁵. They preserve valuable records of everything on monuments in their temples, see above §110.

⁶. Aristides expresses similar views also about Homer at §107, cf. *Or.* III. 577, 582, 586, 663. On this theme see the proem in his *Sarapis* speech (§§1-13), where he calls the poets “unintelligent”. Cf. Isoc. IX 9-11; Pl. *Lg.* 669d; Antiphan. (“*Ποίησις*”) fr. 189 *PCG*; Cleanthes I 486 *SVF*. An opposite view was taken by Pliny the Younger *Epist.* VII 9.14.

⁷. Cf. LSJ, s.v. μῦθος II 2, and Hofmann 1976: 41-3, who points out that in μῦθος the subjective aspect, i.e. the activity of the story-teller, is more prominent than in λόγος (in *Ol.* I.29). Cf. also Rösler 1980: 283-319 and especially 297-8 n.37.

⁸. A suggestion made by Köhnken 1971: 49, n.62.

ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι,⁹ *Nem.* VII.23 and VIII.33. This is in line with what Aristides says about the μῦθοι composed by other poets whose testimony he rejects as untrustworthy.¹⁰ In *Nem.* VII.23 Pindar stresses poetry's power to propagate falsehood.¹¹ Pindar is not criticising Homer's skill as a poet, but rather his ποτανὰ μαχανά which has given more fame to Odysseus than he deserves (20ff.).

b. Aristides' ποικίλος also occurs in *Ol.* I in the same line with μῦθοι (29). This supports further the possibility that Aristides had in mind Pindar's line in which both words are equally used in the same derogatory sense.¹² 'Variety' is of special importance for Pindar who uses frequently the terms ποικίλος and δαιδάλλειν for his poetry.¹³ A pleasing style could arouse suspicion about the truthfulness of the poet.¹⁴

Aristides bearing in mind Aristotle's statement about historians–poets (*Po.* 9.2 τὸν μὲν ἱστορικόν τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ ποιητὴν οἷα ἂν γένοιτο), seems to excuse Pindar by granting him a place of distinction (§112): "Pindar, who seems to keep to the truth in his ἱστορίαι most of all the poets",¹⁵ but equally Aristides realises that Pindar is only a poet, and still suffers from the inaccuracies to which any poet is prone. So, he criticises Pindar's inaccuracies but he is more tolerant towards Pindar than towards other poets.

⁹. On the virtual synonymy of δαιδάλος and ποικίλος see Privitera 1974: 33. For the contrast between ποικίλος and ἀληθής compare Eur. *Ph.* 469-70.

¹⁰. For some examples compare Lucian *Philops.* 4 οἱ μὲν ποιηταὶ... ἐκ τοῦ μύθου τερπνὸν ἐπαγωγότατον ὃν ἐγκαταμινύντες τῇ γραφῇ, οὐπὲρ μάλιστα δέονται πρὸς τοὺς ἀκροατάς, Cicero *ND I.* 16.42 *ea quae poetarum vocibus fusa ipsa suavitate nocuerunt*, cf. Plaut. *Pseud.* 403.

¹¹. Cf. Carey 1981: *ad loc.*

¹². In Homer, ποικίλος generally denotes the skill with which different materials or different colours are combined. The epithet ποικιλομήτης is used metaphorically and from the fifth century on metaphorical usage is common, both in a complimentary (cf. Pind. *fr.* 194.2-3: quoted also by Aristides) and in a derogatory sense. When the latter applies, as here, it could be better translated as "embroidered" or "varied". For the Homeric use of the term (ποικιλομήτης), cf. Wace 1948: 51-5, for more bibliography see Gerber 1982: 64 (ποικίλοις).

¹³. Richardson 1985: 385, 390; Maehler 1963: 90ff. For Pindar's predilection for variety, kept within due limits by the restrictive force of καιρός, see Gianotti 1975: 114; Lanata 1963: 90, and Verdenius 1983: 17-8. Cf. Race 1983b: 95-122.

¹⁴. Dio Cassius 1.1.2 expresses similar views on the truthfulness of the historical writers. On this topic see Avenarius 1956: 26-9.

¹⁵. Pindar declares his interest for true λόγος: cf. *Ol.* II.92: αὐδάσομαι ἐνόρκιον λόγον ἀλαθεῖ νόῳ; *Ol.* IV. 21: οὐ ψεύδεϊ τέγξω λόγον; *Fr.* 11: οὐ ψεῦδος ἐρίξω. For 'ἀλάθεια' as a principle of Pindar's art cf. Hubbard 1985: 104, who argues that Pindar's proclamations of truth "are better taken as assertions of sincerity than of historical ... Pindar's is a poetic truth, not an historical truth". Pindar invokes (*fr.* 205) Ἀλήθεια (daughter of Zeus) pointing to him what he should avoid when he deviates from truth. On that see Spertuti 1950: 209-40.

Quoting only one line from a fuller text (of three lines), cited by Strabo (17, 1,19 p.802) and repeated by Aelianus (*nat. animal.* 7,19), Aristides raises certain objections reporting that Pindar's geography was quite incorrect in his statement about the Egyptian Nome Mendes:

FR. 201 (215).

Αἰγυπτίαν Μένδητα, πὰρ κρημνὸν θαλάσσης
ἔσχατον Νείλου κέρας, αἰγιβάται
ὅθι τράγοι γυναιξὶ μίσγονται

I. Strab. 17,1,19 p.802. 'Εν δὲ τῇ μεσογείῳ τῇ ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σεβεννυτικοῦ καὶ Φατνιτικοῦ στόματος Ἰόεις ἐστὶ καὶ νῆσος καὶ πόλις ἐν τῷ Σεβεννυτικῷ νομῷ. ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ Ἑρμοῦ πόλις καὶ Λύκου πόλις καὶ Μένδης, ὅπου τὸν Πᾶνα τιμῶσι καὶ τῶν ζώων τράγον· ὡς δὲ Πίνδαρός φησιν, οἱ τράγοι ἐνταῦθα γυναιξὶ μίγνυνται· Μένδητα — μίσγονται (*om. codd. EF*) πλησίον δὲ Μένδητος καὶ Διὸς πόλις καὶ αἱ περὶ αὐτὴν λίμναι καὶ Λεοντόπολις·

II. Aristid. 36(48) 2, 298, 27-8 K.

III. cf. Aelian. *nat. animal.* 7, 19 καὶ ὁμιλεῖν γυναιξὶ φασιν αὐτοῦς (*hircos*), καὶ ἔοικεν αὐτὸ θαυμάζειν Πίνδαρος; *ad hymnum in Iovem Ammonem (fr.36) referebat Hartung, sed cf. L. Lehnus, L' inno a Pan di Pindaro, 199sq.*

IV. Georgius Choeroboscus., schol. in Theodos. Alex. canon. nomin., Αἰγυπτίαν Μενδητα.

V. Priscianus., *instit.* 6, 60 Μένδης Μένδητος *nomen est urbis Aegyptiacae, cuius mentionem Pindarus facit.*

Egypt was probably far from Pindar's experience and perhaps also his interest.¹⁶ The fact that he mentions Egypt three times (*Nem. X.5; Frs. 82, 201*), does not indicate that Pindar travelled there.¹⁷ Pindar associated the cult of god Min with Nome Mendes (Aristides knew its Egyptian name Θμοῦις). We can suppose with Bowra,¹⁸ that he heard various accounts from travellers, that at Mendes the Egyptians honoured the god Pan and goats.¹⁹

¹⁶ Bowra 1964: 371-2.

¹⁷ In a metaphor in *Isth.* II.42 the river Nile marks the limit of eastern navigation that the hospitality of Xenocrates could reach. In this text Nile typifies the bounds impassable to human enterprise and therefore, it seems impossible for Pindar to have had a personal idea of the geography of the area. However, Pindar visited Cyrene in 462/1 BC, cf. Chamoux 1953: 175.

¹⁸ I doubt the correctness of Bowra's suggestion to incorporate *fr.201* and other references about Egypt, into the 'hymn to Ammon' (*fr.36*), from where we possess only the opening line from schol. *Pyth.* IX.90c. Uerschels is also wrong in attributing *fr.201* to 'hymn to Pan', cf. the discussion of *fr.99* on p.108.

¹⁹ Uerschels 1962: 34-5. I do not think that Pindar misinterpreted – as Bowra (1964: 372), suggested – the rite in which goats were used to make women fertile. I think that the custom had some historic existence. The Greeks believed that unnatural intercourse with animals regularly took place in Mendes if we accept Herodotus' claim (2.46.14), Καλέεται δὲ ὁ τε τράγος καὶ ὁ Πᾶν αἰγυπτιστὶ Μένδης. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ νομῷ τούτῳ ἐπ' ἐμέο τοῦτο τὸ τέρας· γυναικὶ τράγος ἐμίσητο ἀναφανδόν· τοῦτο ἐς ἐπίδεξιν ἀνθρώπων ἀπίκετο. How-Wells (1912: *ad loc.*), arguing for the veracity of this custom, compare the Jewish prohibitions against such abominations (*Lev.* 20.16). Cf. also Plut. *Brut. animal. rat.* 5 p.989A ὁ Μενδήσιος ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τράγος λέγεται πολλαῖς καὶ καλαῖς συνειργνύμενος γυναιξὶν οὐκ εἶναι μίγνυσθαι πρόθυμος; the rite is denounced by the Christian authors: Clem. Al. *Protr.* 2.32.4.5; Theodoret. *Theol. Graec. affect.* 3.851. Aelian in *nat. animal.* 7, 18ff., discussing odd modes of animal behaviour, claims that women have intercourse with τράγοι and κύνες referring both to Pindar and to a legal case in Rome, where a woman was convicted for committing adultery with a κύων. Although Aelian claimed never to have left Italy, he perhaps drew

According to Aristides, Pindar had a limited knowledge of the topography of the Nome. According to his explanation, Pindar imagined Mendes' geography to be like that of his Boeotia but according to Aristides he was justified by poetic licence in speaking in this way. Nevertheless, Aristides amends Pindar's statement that the whole Nome Mendes and its city Thmouis is located in a great spreading plain away from the sea.

Decisive to the whole question is the meaning of κρημνός and its subsequent interpretation offered by Aristides. Κρημνός in Pindar means:

- a. a steep *river* bank (*Ol.* II.22),
- b. a bank of a *lake* (*Pyth.* II.34), and
- c. a *cliff* (*Pae.* XII.8).²⁰

van der Weiden propounds the plausible explanation that κρημνός qualifies the Nile's banks on the ground that the Nile was important for life in Egypt.²¹

The ἔσχατον κέρας is the eastern branch of the Nile which lies near the junction with lake Tanais.²² We might assume that Pindar, due to his limited knowledge, confused this water tract of land with the sea. Aristides who was an eye-witness observes the mistake and corrects appropriately.

The source for Pind. *Fr.* 201

However, we should consider Aristides' attitude towards Pindar and to poetry in general in the context of his refutations. The sophists of 'the Second Sophistic' show in the versatility of their interests that they have something of the general curiosity of their predecessors. Aristides' account of his sojourn in Egypt is not a mere *mimesis* of Herodotus that prompts him to discuss the Nile floods, but it is an intelligent correction.

In the opening lines of his *Αἰγύπτιος*, Aristides mentions the research activities he undertook in Egypt. He tells us that he had collected all the possible information

on similar manuals or he heard various accounts in illustrating his writings with material outside Italy (mainly from Egypt, Thracian Bosphoros, Arabs *etc.*).

²⁰. Cf. the meaning of ἀγκίκρημνον in *fr.* 82, translated by van der Weiden (1991: 223), as "clinging to its river banks".

²¹. *Ibid.* 223; she argues that the steepness usually implied in κρημνός agrees with the configuration of the river which often has steep banks (South and Eastern side). But we must say that it is not true for the district of Mendes.

²². Slater s.v. Μένδης.

concerning that natural phenomenon and he had discussed various interpretations with Greek residents (§109), native Egyptians (§122), and Roman and Ethiopian officials.²³

He studied the religion and customs of the country, as well as its topography and geographical configuration, comparing them with guide books,²⁴ literary references, and several treatises he read on the Nile's inundation and the nature of Egypt in general.²⁵

A detailed of the geographical morphology of the area around the Nile was essential to his lengthy refutations. Strabo in the section on Egypt (XVII. p. 802), discussed the morphology on the Nile's δέλτα, the rivers' στόματα, the nearby cities and their divine agents. Therefore, it seems quite probable that Aristides consulted the work of Strabo,²⁶ where he may have found *fr.* 201. It is probable that the doxographers and geographers in an early stage, quoted *fr.* 201 in their works; its literary value was not broadly appreciated.²⁷ Reading Strabo, Aristides probably came across Pindar's words in which he noticed the discrepancy between Pindar's account and the real topography of the area.

Pindar had an idea that the Nile-flood was caused by a colossal statue six hundred feet high, moving its feet,²⁸ and it was also responsible for the river's *ξυμμετρία*.²⁹ The fact that Aristides ignores this theory indicates that he did not use that poem of Pindar here in constructing his refutation, although one might have expected Aristides to do so: the nature of his discourse is concerned with the discussion of various theories advanced by authors of the past and a possible reference to Pindar's 'lost' poem would have been welcome in this context. Pindar's testimony seems to be out of Aristides' main rhetorical

23. Behr 1968a: 17 with ns. 52, 53. Aristides (§1) reports that he travelled up to the land of Ethiopia and he met the Ethiopian Deputy Prefect of the region, see Behr 1968a: 18.

24. Cf. §1 ἀλλ' ὦν μὲν ἐν ταῖς βύβλοις τὰ μέτρα ὑπῆρχεν ἐκεῖθεν πορισάμενος, ὦν δὲ μὴ ἐξ ἐτοίμου λαβεῖν ἦν ἐκμετρήσας αὐτὸς μετὰ τῶν παρ' ἐκάστοις ἱερέων καὶ προφητῶν. Cf also §§ 20, 65, 115, the last three concern the cubit levels of the inundation.

25. In composing his refutations, Aristides seems to have used among his sources: Herodotus (§3), and Ephorus (§§77, 85, from where he took Euthymenes' account and perhaps several others). Some traces of the book can be found in Aristides' treatise, particularly near the end (§§104-13).

26. Strabo quotes 26 fragments from Pindar; in 20 of them Pindar's name is mentioned.

27. All the quotations of the fragment are concerned with ethnographic and geographic interest.

28. A scholium on Aratus (*fr.*282) includes the words: οἱ δὲ τὸν παρὰ Πινδάρῳ ἑκατοντορόγχιον <δαίμονα>, ἀφ' οὗ τῆς κινήσεως τῶν ποδῶν τὸν Νεῖλον πλημμυρεῖν. Porphyrius also wrote a treatise “περὶ τῶν κατὰ Πινδάρου τοῦ Νείλου πηγῶν”.

29. Philostr. *imag.* 1, 5; cf. Philostr. Apollon. Tyan. 6, 26 *de Nili fontibus*: πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ περὶ δαιμόνων ᾄδουσιν, οἷα καὶ Πινδάρῳ κατὰ σοφίαν ὑμνῆται περὶ τοῦ δαίμονος, ὃν ταῖς πηγαῖς ταύταις ἐφίστησιν ὑπὲρ ξυμμετρίας τοῦ Νείλου.

agenda here in his *Αἰγυπτιακός*; his complain about the poet's inaccuracy is rather occasional and his citation of *fr.* 201 in all likelihood is derived from a secondary source like that of Strabo.

However Pindar's text differs in the traditions of Strabo and Aristides:

a. Strabo's quotation – which is our main source for *fr.* 201 –, starts with Μένδητα down to μίσγονται.

b. Aristides' quotation includes also Αἰγυπτίαν qualifying Μένδητα, and he preserves the right *lectio* θαλάσσης (accepted by modern editors); on that Strabo gives the variant θαλάσσης and both share the *lectio* παρά (*sic* O, Strab. XVII 802), corrected in πὰρ by Boeckh.

We may think of two possibilities to account for these textual variations:

i. Aristides may have had a text of Strabo which included the reading Αἰγυπτίαν. The absence of Αἰγυπτίαν from Strabo's text may be due to omission: some poetic quotations in later prose writers get shortened in their manuscript tradition, when texts are copied and recopied and the scribes some times tend to shorten or even cut out the poetic quotations as less important.³⁰ This may have happened since the Pindaric lines are omitted in the *codd.* E (*Vat. gr.* 482, 14th *cen.*) and F (*Vat. gr.* 1329, 1320/1330 AD), and are moreover excluded in the editions of Kramer (1852), Müller–Dübner (1853) and Meineke (1877 repr. 1969).

ii. Aristides may have added Αἰγυπτίαν on his own accord because he knew that Mendes was in Egypt and it just happened to fit with the metre. As far the metre is concerned, we cannot check it due to the limited extent of the quotation (*metrum: dactyloepitr.*).

³⁰. This is of frequent occurrence in the tradition of *ὑπομνήματα* where various quotations are left out in the subsequent copies of an *ὑπόμνημα*, comparing them with the corresponding Byzantine scholia; cf. the case in P.Oxy. 2536 (Theon's *ὑπόμνημα* on *Pyth.* XII): the l.29 of the papyrus contains a quotation from Eur. *Oedipus* (τόν θ' ὕμνοποιόν δόνα[χ', δν ἐκφύει Μέ]λας | ποταμός ἀηδόν' εὐπνόων αὐλῶν σοφὴν. *fr.* 556N² [= *fr.* 100N²]), that is omitted in later Pindaric scholia. The same practice happens in *ὑπομνήματα* on prose (Demosthenes), cf. Maehler 1993: 95-127.

We should not rule out the possibility that Aristides quarried *fr.* 201 from some other author's account of Egyptian cities or rare and strange customs.³¹

³¹. Aelianus alludes *fr.* 201 in a discussion of women's relations with animals (τράγοι, κύνες), observing that this custom excited Pindar's imagination 'θαυμάζειν'.

CONCLUSIONS

The importance of Aristides' testimony regarding the transmission of the Pindaric text has not received due attention in Pindaric scholarly literature. Our dissertation aims to fill this gap. It is certain that his exemplar antedates the archetype of the Byzantine Mss tradition of Pindar and is thus a valuable testimony for Pindar's text.

The intentions, the principles and the techniques of Aristides' Pindaric quotations are examined within the wider context of the cultural milieu of the Second Sophistic and the archaistic predilections prominent in the period, as well as in relation to the orator's own personal preferences and idiosyncrasies and his particular outlook as an outstanding second century literary figure.

Focus is given to his 'ideological' interaction with the Pindaric *παραθέματα* (quotations) in his work and their contribution to his overall argument. An insight is gained regarding the presence of classical authors in the cultural life of the Imperial Age and the close relationship between rhetoric and poetry in particular.

1. Aristides and the Pindaric text

Our research has found strong evidence that Aristides is often working from an original copy of Pindar and that he is also drawing on ancient *ὑπομνήματα* and various other sources.

Overall, his quotations antedate the selection which was made in the late second century. This is particularly evident from the fact that he cites from the so-called *ἔργον εἰς Θεούς*, that is, works other than the *Epinicians* which were the part of Pindar's work which survived the selection.

He thus preserves a considerable number of fragments that would have been otherwise lost to us, as he is the only source we have for these passages not preserved in the direct Mss tradition, and he offers a valuable insight into the state of Pindar's text in the second century. Even in places where Pindar's words are given in paraphrase, his paraphrases sometimes enable us to guess what reading he must have found in the text of Pindar.

Pindar is the source (usually acknowledged by Aristides, in a few instances named by the scholiast) of about 71 quotations. We possess 25 quotations from extant odes of victory—with none from *Nemean odes*, whereas 40 quotations were excerpted from the so-called *ἔργον εἰς Θεούς*.¹ The other six are classified as *dubia*.

In the *Epinicians* where we have Mss support, his testimony has ancient authority where it preserves the true reading against some Mss errors.

¹. However, Aristides does not quote from the books of *Προσόδια*, *Παρθένεια*, and *Ἐγκώμια*.

Moreover, as his quotations are off the main-stream tradition, he is also a valuable testimony for our understanding of the textual transmission of Pindar. He is an authoritative witness of the antiquity of variant readings which appear in the Mss tradition.

Most significantly, our research has shown that Aristides employed ancient commentaries, and in a few cases he preferred to quote Pindar from an ancient *ὑπόμνημα*, rather than from an edition. In doing so, he is following a tendency evident also in other Imperial authors, *e.g.* Plutarch.

Moreover we show that the wording of Aristides' exegeses which follow his quotations from *Epinicia* overlaps with or is similar to that of the scholia vetera. In addition the content of Pindar's scholia on *Olympians* cited by Aristides in *Ors.* II, XVII and XXVIII – probably from an ancient *ὑπόμνημα* – is close to that of the Medieval scholia transmitted in the Byzantine Ms. A (*Ambros.* C 222 inf.). Thus, Aristides' testimony offers evidence for the antiquity of the corresponding scholia preserved in the A tradition.

Aristides may have also quoted Pindar from a number of secondary sources: (paroemiographical collections, mythological *compendia*, anthologies, *lexica*, paraphrases, personal set of notes, or through the text of other authors ['double borrowing']). While it is true that this is often impossible to prove and must therefore remain a mere possibility, I nevertheless believe to have made a case for a number of passages where this assumption deserves consideration.

Aristides employs specific techniques in citing Pindar which formalise his treatment of the Pindaric quotations; *e.g.* when quoting mythological episodes treated by Pindar he always cites from paraphrases which function as mythological *exempla*. For example: in the *Smyrnaean orations* Aristides has in mind mythological material which Pindar treated in his *Epinicia* and *Dithyrambs* and which Aristides also found in ancient commentaries on Pindar. Paraphrasing or alluding to various parts of the mythic sections that Pindar employed in his odes, and correlating them to contemporary Smyrna or to stages that the city had undergone to reach its present state, Aristides' intention is to praise the new city with a fitting myth, which functions as a sort of *mythical decoration*.

2. Aristides' Quotations from Classical Authors

In the flourishing period of the Antonines, Aristides epitomises the preoccupations of the second sophistic at their finest; he scorned extempore speeches devoting himself instead to the fine artistry of declamatory orations. He stands out as a model of Attic prose deriving style and inspiration from his deep knowledge of the classical tradition of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. An exemplary πεπαιδευμένος of his times he displays the depth of his erudition and the wide range of his literary interests

through innumerable quotations from authors of all periods and all genres of Greek literature. Adherent of the Isocratean spirit of edifying rhetoric he propagates the educational pretences of his art through argument and example; his is a work of fine culture, showing great familiarity with both poetry and prose which make their presence abundantly felt in his frequent citations, innumerable allusions and stylistic borrowings.

Quotations from Greek poetry abound. Aristides excerpted the classical texts in search for notable expressions, seeking to buttress his arguments with selective extracts from early Greek poetry in order not only to lend authority to his arguments by relating them to the revered literary figures of classical Greece but also in order to demonstrate the primacy of rhetoric and the validity of its claims, *contra philosophiam*, to be a genuine art carrying valuable educational import.

He quotes in all contexts and for all intents and purposes: in his panegyrics for cities, in open letters or miscellaneous speeches for special occasions, birthday *encomia*, ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι and in his various prose-hymns, the religious thematic and the over-pious overtones in most of which draw on the Pindaric archetype of hymnal praises. The entire corpus betrays the same zeal to persistently display the profundity of Aristides' erudition and the richness of Greek culture and literary tradition.

3. Quotations from Poetry and Pindar in particular

Quotations from Pindar surpass in number all those from the lyric, tragic or comic poets and Aristides is in line with his times when he shows that Pindar is his most popular poet after Homer. Pindar's popularity in the Second Sophistic makes it obvious why Aristides considered him so important. The more original lyric production ceased, the more Pindar was appreciated as its unparalleled summit and model. The disappearance of the great lyric and poetic styles heightened the appreciation of Pindar's diction, which acquired a great importance especially within the philosophical and polemical literature among pagans and Christians² over the next centuries.

The value assigned to Pindar's hymnal poetry by teachers and practitioners of epideictic oratory as a depository of epideictic τόποι for the composition of epideictic orations exemplifies the substantial affinity between poetry and epideictic oratory and bears testimony to the place the teaching of poetry and poets (Pindar figuring high among them) occupied in the curriculum of the rhetorical schools of the time.³ The close interaction between poetry and (epideictic) oratory was illustrated in the προγυμνάσματα

2. Clemens Alex., Eusebius, Gregorius Corinthius, Gregorius Nazianzinus, Origenes, Photius.

3. Cf. Webb 1997: 359. Webb explains how competitions of epideictic orations were introduced in festivals in the first century AD and gradually began to displace poetical *encomia*. It is roughly in this time that poetic eulogy of cities disappeared and the orators started to expand in genres like *hymn* and the *epithalamium* which hitherto were the exclusive domain of poets. Cf. Russell 1979b: 104-7. Bowie (1989: 210), agrees that prose rhetoric is consciously competitive towards poetry but finds it wrong to think that rhetors wanted to displace poetry altogether.

where training in rhetorical skills involved the demonstration of examples taken from poetry. Maximus of Tyre went to the extreme of claiming that the teaching of rhetoric, which was the principal form of the teaching of composition, sufficed to give its pupils the skills for poetical composition; what is certain is that the complex relation between poetry and rhetoric involves an understanding of the teaching of both in the cultural background of rhetors and poets.

The most comprehensive educational program in rhetoric included the study of lyric poetry, where attention was drawn to the necessity of becoming familiar with the style of the lyric model. If we look at the statistics of papyrus finds classed by literary genres, we find that dramatic poetry follows Homer and epic, with oratory and lyric in third and fourth positions respectively.⁴ We also know from the rhetoricians' handbooks that the reading of lyric poetry was one of the exercises for older students when they reached the stage of the *προγυμνάσματα*, i.e. 'Εγκώμιον' (praise), 'Ψόγος' (invective).

4. Reasons for quoting Pindar

Aristides gleaned Pindar along with other classical works in general for ornamental and for argumentative reasons. He adorned his speeches to impress the reader by lifting his style and reinforcing his argument, creating rhetorical emphasis. By working frequent and knowledgeable allusions to his odes into the texture of his rhetorical compositions he lays his claim to the true παιδεία for which acquaintance with Pindar is a necessary condition.

The selection of his quotations from Pindar in particular is modified to suit his Atticistic 'Kunstprosa' (: change in word order, dialectic simplifications, interpolations *etc.*). He incorporated his quotations carefully into the context of his speech meticulously avoiding obscurity and archaism.

More specifically, Aristides' quotations from Pindar appear to serve the following purposes:

a. Aristides was interested himself in Pindar's pronouncements about the nature of his own art. Pindaric gnomic statements quoted in Aristides are primarily functional in the sense that they fulfil a rhetorical purpose within the particular contexts of the speech.

b. *Authority*: the quotation supports a statement of Aristides as a sort of tangible *proof* increasing the cogency of the argument.

c. *Illustration – comparison*: the quotation gives an mythological example or an *ἐνθύμημα*, inviting a comparison of the situation in Aristides with that in its original context.

⁴. However, we should be cautious in deciding about the popularity of an author based entirely on papyri finds.

d. *Ornamentation*: Aristides interlaced his orations with masterpieces from Pindar's poetry for decorative purposes.

e. *Incidental*: the quotation forms part of an anecdote told for its own sake.

f. The seriousness of Pindar and his deep religious commitment appealed to Aristides.

5. Structure of the quotations

Pindaric quotations are invoked by Aristides either to:

- a. assist in praising *i.* a god, *ii.* an individual(s) or *iii.* cities, or to
- b. support his argument: *i.* defending oratory against Plato, *ii.* against the sophists, *iii.* in favour of 'concord' among the Greek cities in Asia Minor, *iv.* in specific cases, *e.g.* *self-encomium*,
- c. ornamental reasons,
- d. critical arguments against other poets' specific errata

6. Ideological reasons for quoting Pindar

Aristides exploits Pindar's poetry not only on a *textual-morphological* level (quotation, paraphrase, reminiscence, allusion) but also on an *ideological* one.

He was interested in Pindar's pronouncements about the nature of his own art. Pindar's statements are primarily functional in the sense that they fulfil a specific purpose within the particular contexts in which they occur.⁵ At the same time their impressiveness is partly due to their gnomic character: they appear to be the distillation of the poet's own theory on poetry and his views of the world, divinity, and the vicissitudes of human fortune and thus to have a significance reaching far beyond their immediate context.

Aristides appears to have been interested in those ideas and saw them as standing in close vicinity to his own. The way in which Aristides saw his role as "σοφός"—orator—and defined his relations with contemporary sophists and defended his "pure" art, recalls Pindar's wording. The orator's intense spiritual life, which may be described in terms of either piety or credulity (or a mixture of the two), underlies most of his works and is in line with Pindar's religious ideas. Thus, thematic material and terminology are furnished from Pindar's poetry.

7. Pindar and Aristides' prose-hymns

Theological reasons also represent an important motive for Aristides to be so eagerly citing Pindar. Pindar's religiosity was congenial with Aristides' pronounced

⁵ Cf. **Richardson** 1985: 384: "They cannot be understood apart from the poems of which they are an integral part"; cf. the discussion in **Harriott** 1969: 58ff.

piety; his hymnal praises provide *topoi* and also direct influence for Aristides' prose-hymns.

In 9 out of his 10 prose-hymns,⁶ Aristides shows a specific predilection for Pindar's non-epinician poetry.⁷ Aristides found the nature and the character of Pindaric poems to the gods congenial to his own prose-hymns. The poet's words formed an important part of the praise towards the honoured divinity.

Epideictic prose in the era of the second sophistic lays claims to being an appropriate form of praise which compares favourably with hymnal poetry in the task of praising persons (dignitaries) or places (cities); when it comes to the religious subject of praising divinities, Aristides defends his art in the form of prose-hymns against the traditional poetic form of hymnal praise (in the prologue of his prose-hymn *εἰς Σάραπιν*); he moans that the rhetor's task in composing a prose-hymn is more demanding than that of the poets. The poet Aristides has in mind when making these comparisons is most probably Pindar who in the prose-hymns is by and large the only source of the orator's citations from lyric poetry (notwithstanding a single exception of one citation from Alcman). Pindar after all is the model poet for Aristides' own lyric verses snatches of which are cited in *Hieroi Logoi*. These verses along with the Pindaric quotations in prose-hymns are an important indication that Pindar still enjoyed great prestige and was highly acclaimed as the outstanding lyric poet from the classical age.

8. Pindar in Polemical Orations

Pindaric quotations also occur in the context of Aristides' arguments in polemical orations either in defence of his art against philosophy's (Plato's) onslaught or in defence of the personality of the four Athenian political leaders defamed by Plato. Moreover, in the same way as Aristides adduces the words of Pindar in support of the refutation of Plato's charge against the value and nature of rhetoric, he is also drawing on the lyric poet's verses to entrench his argument about the function and character of all poetry and music (*e.g.* defending Pindar's *Dithyrambs* as accomplished artistic forms). Pindar is also called upon to support arguments against the poor quality of Aristides' contemporary sophists, known as it were for their vanity and the fierce rivalries that often flared among them.

In each case it is shown that Aristides detaches the passage quoted from the wider Pindaric context and its original intended meaning in order to better serve the particular needs of his rhetorical argument.

⁶ Pindar is not quoted in *Or.* XL.

⁷ *Ol.* VI.7 is exceptional, and the quotations from *Isth.* III.70 and VIII.61 are taken probably from a lexical source.

9. Pindar and Aristides' 'artificial' declamations

Pindar is out of Aristides' rhetorical agenda for his *Declamations* V-XVI. These are rhetorical exercises in which Aristides shows archaistic tendencies following the demands of Attic Classicism.⁸ The practice of presenting artificial declamations was highly regarded in Aristides' time both as a means of instruction as to how to deliver a good speech and as an exhibition of the *vis oratoris*.⁹

Even though there are only few¹⁰ literary quotations in these speeches, the overwhelming majority are taken from the historians and particularly from Thucydides (40) and Xenophon (14), due to the particular nature of these compositions in which Aristides deals mainly with historical issues of the classical past.¹¹ Pindaric quotations are as a rule avoided, although the ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλιν ἡδομεν—which exceptionally appears in *Or.* VIII.21—, had long ago become a phrastic *cliché* and metonymy for Athens in oratory.¹²

10. *Or.* XXVIII.55-8: a case of decontextualised reading

It is notable that in quoting Pindar Aristides sees him as a book author – he treats his words in isolation from the social context and does not see the particular social function and reference of Pindar's poetry. This is evident in the use he makes of Pindar when defending himself against a charge that he is interjecting self-praise (typical of the sophists at the time) in a speech ostensibly in honour of a goddess (Athena). He responds by scouring large sections of the classical literature to compile an extensive catalogue of similar instances of *self-encomia* in Greek literature. In the section which refers to lyric poets he cites from Sappho, Alcman, Simonides and Pindar.

His quotes from Pindar (with whom the argument reaches a crescendo) of instances exemplifying the poet's alleged self eulogy, misrepresent the poet whose true intentions he misreads. He lives many centuries later and reads poetry from the book without taking into consideration the social character of Pindar's poetry. Pindar's intention is to coin a flattering compliment for his fellow citizens and not to make an advertisement of his poetic skill, *e.g.* *fr.* 194; *Pae.* VI.1-6.

⁸. In these preserved declamations Aristides follows the practice of the 5th century BC sophists of presenting both sides of the argument.

⁹. Bowie relates the emergence of fictitious declamations with the severe restriction of the opportunities for grand style political orations in the fashion of a Demosthenes or Pericles already during the Hellenistic period and certainly in the Imperial times; on the other hand, the recourse to historical themes from the classical past, beside the purely literary aspect of the general Archaic turn of the times, is also explained as offering the Greeks a way of coping with their dissatisfying present under the Romans (Bowie 1974: 169).

¹⁰. The 44 of the 46 Homeric quotations come from the special *Or.* XVI, inspired by the ninth book of the *Iliad*. For other literary quotes see the following note.

¹¹. In *Ors.* V-XVI, we have totally 139 quotations distributed as following: Th. (40), X. (14), Hdt. (6), Plut. (4), D. (20), Isoc. (1), Aristot. (2), Pl. (4); literary: Hom. (46), Men. (1), Aesop. (1).

¹². Cf. Aeschin., Plut., Luc., Lib., Him., see *testimonia* in *fr.* 76.

But this instance of misreading is a very exceptional one, and is due to the specific nature of the speech and the strains the poet is under to defend himself.

11. Aristides refers to the following Pindaric books:

A'. Epinicians

Ὀλυμπιονίκαις (I, II, III, VI, VII, IX): Aristides' knowledge of Pindar's Epinician poetry unquestionably derives mainly from the *Olympians*; he quotes twice as much from the *Olympians* as he does from the *Pythians*. Aristides refers to six *Olympian* odes. Textual evidence suggest that Odes II and IX were studied from the original and for the former Aristides drew on ancient *ὑπομνήματα* for his interpretation of 'σοφός'. *Olympians* I and VII were particularly favoured by Aristides and paraphrased extensively in various orations.

Πυθιονίκαις (II, III, VI, VIII, IX): Aristides was interested in the sententious thoughts that Pindar expressed in *Pythians* II, III, VIII, and IX and the use of either a *gnomologium* or a commentary as a source, is possible, although his quotations from *Pythian* II suggest the use of an original edition, and the quotation from *Pythian* VI was probably taken from a lexical source.

It is certain that for his two quotes from *Pythian* III he drew on ancient *ὑπομνήματα*. This suggests the possibility that this ode was studied in his school, and annotated by his grammaticus Alexander.

Ἰσθμιονίκαις (III, VIII.): Aristides preserves a tiny portion from *Isthmians* III and VIII in *Or.* XLV among a list of poetic words which probably were taken from a lexical source. Aristides' quotations from the last two books of Pindar's *Ἐπίνικοι* are very limited.

Νεμεονίκαις: Surprisingly he is not interested in *Nemeans*. It is doubtful if Aristides' education exposed him to much of *Nemeans*.

It is hard to assess the quality of the exemplar that Aristides employed. He introduces variants even in verbatim quotations from *Epinicians*, and the divergences in the quoted text is to be attributed to Aristides' diverse purposes.

B'. Non-Epinicians

Aristides in quotations from Pindar's non-epinician poetry gives occasionally the literary genre to which they belong. So we hear of *hymns*, and *dithyrambs*.

Ὑμνοί: His quotations are a remarkably valuable addition to our remnants of Pindaric *hymn*-literature.¹³ In five different orations he preserves six fragments from the lost *hymn to Zeus*, which the Teubner editors of Pindar printed among others preserved in the following order: *frs.* 32; *33; 33c; *33d; *31 and *35a. The quotations from the *hymns* are usually given in paraphrase. This preference suggests the probability that Pindar's hymns, especially that to Zeus, were paraphrased for teaching purposes. It is probable that Aristides employed these paraphrases for his quotations rather than a standard text.

Παιᾶνες: The six opening lines of *Paeon* VI are confirmed by P.Oxy. 841, but there has been corruption in Mss of Aristides.

Διθυράμβων Α' et Β': *Frs.* 76 and 77 appealed to Aristides in praising Athens and Smyrna. He is our unique source for *fr.* 81.

Κεχωρισμένα τῶν Παρθενείων: Aristides seems to know Pindar's *hymn to Pan*; our knowledge of *fr.*99* is due to him.

Ὑπορχήματα: *Fr.* 108a is quoted twice, possibly either from *epist. Socr.* 1, or from an anthology.

Θρηνοί: Two small portions (*frs.* 129.7; *136a) are paraphrased freely. It is probable that he knew both quotations from an anthology like Plutarch.

Incertorum Librorum: He is our important testimony for *frs.* 146; 169a.1-8, 16-7; and unique for *fr.* 182, 194, 226, 237, 260 and 329. *Fr.* 201 is derived probably from Strabo, and *fr.* 283 is paraphrased.

Dubia: Our knowledge of *frs.* 350-5 are due to his own reading and seem to have been quarried from a lexical source.

Finally, it seems probable that Aristides knew a number of anecdotes about Pindar's life from a Hellenistic source, since his account agrees with *Vita Thomana*.

¹³. He is unique source for *frs.* 32; *31; *35a; *38; 48.

APPENDIX

I. Aristides as a Second Century Intellectual

II. Indices

Aristides as a Second Century Intellectual.

1. Aristides as the Second Century model of πεπαιδευμένος

A canon of Attic purism,¹ an exemplar of erudition and archaic predilections of the Second Sophistic and, above all, a defender of an Isocratean ‘philosophic’ rhetoric distancing himself from the showy practices of the stipendiary sophists, Aristides had attained enormous popularity both in his times and later, in the Byzantine times.

The most prominent side of Aristides' character was his devotion to the healing god Asclepius and his protracted struggle to get well from his persistent illness. His recollections of his diseases in the six *Hieroi Logoi* represent not only a careful record of his disease but mainly a diary recounting his responses to divine revelation as they expound the god's deeds. He owes the choice of his art to divine oracle, and in the sense that his art is god-given to him he may feel that he is chosen by god to serve rhetoric. Thus he is extremely self-conscious about his art and is utterly serious about it both in purpose and in execution;² scholars have attempted to interpret his relation to his art through the personal moments he experienced in his struggle with his disease and his dealings with his gods.³ Aristides styles himself as an orator and disclaims the name of a sophist (a title for which he had no respect).⁴ His view of oratory is indebted to Isocrates' ‘philosophic’ oratory⁵ and he avoids disputational or showy rhetoric to devote himself to the more serious tasks in declamatory rhetoric. Prose is the medium and he considers it to be equivalent to poetry in diction.

Interest in Aristides' ‘personality’ has persistently in our times centred on the fact that he is considered as emblematic of the second century ‘*concordia discors*’ between rhetoric and his ‘personal religion’. Moreschini, more recently, finds Aristides' intimate religiousness most interesting exactly in that here we have “a singular example of religiousness in the second century, not of a philosopher, nor a priest, but a cultured man” (πεπαιδευμένος).⁶ In this respect, it is Aristides' prose-hymns (*Hieroi Logoi*) that attract the greatest attention.

The important novelty in Moreschini's approach is that he draws attention particularly to Aristides' figure as a highly educated and erudite man (πεπαιδευμένος) of the epoch, in whose erudition, and under the roof of rhetoric (to which primacy is

¹. Cf. **Anderson** 1993: 89: “Of all the Atticists he turns out to be the most conspicuously ‘purist’, and is small wonder that Philostratus calls him τεχνικώτατος (most skilful)”. Anderson points out as a test of Aristides' Attic purism the fact that he knows that it is more Attic to say δεσμοί instead of δεσμά and Οιδίπουν instead of Οιδίποδα, although some elements of κοινή still creep in.

². Philostratus (2.584-5) considers Aristides as the most disciplined of all the sophists.

³. **Behr** (1968a: 55-6), refers to *Or.* II. 429-35.

⁴. Though Philostratus classifies him as one; **Swain** (1996: 255) advises that we should avoid use of the term ‘sophist’ when speaking of Aristides. Cf. the discussion on *fr.* 226 n.5.

⁵. *Or.* III. 677-81; see Isocrates' *Against the Sophists* and *Antidosis*.

⁶. **Moreschini** 1994: 1234-5.

acknowledged) find shelter both philosophy and religion. Philosophy is to be found not in a particular “formal” aspect of a school or dogma, but neither in the popularised form of a “vulgata”. It is, rather, the philosophy “diffused” into the people of culture of which it forms an essential part. Aristides, on the other hand, is exemplary of the epoch in that his religious philosophy reflects the era's tendency towards syncretism and monotheism. Following Behr,⁷ Moreschini acknowledges that Aristides is a true polytheist of the pagan second century. He accepts, however, that the rhetor finds room to combine the implicit monotheism of the *Hymn to Zeus* with his “conversion” or rather intense devotion to Asclepius, since Aristides has not lost sight of Zeus' primacy in his polytheistic pantheon, which allows him to also worship Serapes and Isis. He still singles out, however, the intensity of devotion, characteristic of monotheism towards which the times are moving.

It is in the activity of the πεπαιδευμένος that philosophy and rhetoric meet for Aristides. As indicated already, by philosophy we should mean the diffused eclectic awareness that falls far short of the precision and meticulous consistency implied in the affiliation to a particular school. Isocrates has impressed on him the conception of the higher offices of rhetoric as a morally aspiring art and, closer to Aristides, Cicero, has bequeathed to him an attraction to Plato's spiritualism as a suitable platform to ‘moralise’ rhetorical discourse, while Plato's pristine attic diction may have added to Plato the additional allure of high literary value.

Stoics, on the other hand, could also have enriched his religious convictions and his “spiritualistic melange” with the notion, *e.g.*, of divine providence, or the belief that god is at the origin of the universe or even ideas supportive of his vaguely underlying monotheism.⁸

Already in Cicero's time an attempt was made to “merge the figures of the eloquent philosopher and the philosophical author”,⁹ a fact that also holds true of Quintilian, while Dio's turn to philosophy had not broken his links with oratory. But during Aristides' time philosophy had raised the stakes, the controversy had rekindled and the orator strongly felt the duty to defend his art “as a parent protects his child”; in the spirit of the maxim “*amicus Plato sed major amica disciplina*” he devotes two of his most important orations against philosophy's affront. He admires Plato, no less as a literary

7. Behr 1968a: 151.

8. Other scholars have explicitly related Aristides' religious philosophy with Posidonius; cf. Weinreich 1914: 605.

9. Kennedy 1972: 584. Cicero (*de Orat.* 2. 94) points out that Isocrates had called his theory and practice φιλοσοφία. Defenders of rhetoric like Quintilian and Aristides would more or less explicitly identify the good speech of rhetoric with the morally right, virtuous kind of speech. However, as Karadimas (1996: 3) points out, the thorny theoretical problem between philosophy and rhetoric which could not be removed, as long as rhetoric remained the kind of art it defines itself to be, is that it uses, and is accused by philosophy to be using, persuasion. Rhetoric thus had to defend itself against philosophy without denouncing persuasion.

figure, but he cannot accept his belittling of rhetoric or of statesmen (the four Athenian politicians) that shone in the time that is also the classical period for rhetoric.

But Moreschini's most appealing idea is one we have no hesitation to adopt, namely, that Aristides' eclectic philosophy was of the sort of 'uncommitted awareness' of a πεπαιδευμένος whose wide ranging erudition underlay and supported his primary art, that of speech writing, the virtues of which were sought in the form, the diction and the delivery rather than in the content.

High in its artistic profile and elegance, but humble in the scope of its message, Aristides' rhetoric sought its brilliance in recalling the past and celebrating the present rather than contributing to shaping the future. But in this consists after all the profile of his age, an epoch glowing in the glories of the past and the material flourishing of the present, yet with little determination or ideas for shaping its own future towards which, as towards the rootless times in which it flourishes, this, the last great fire of antiquity, has a dispirited view.

2. Aristides and the rivalry between Philosophy and Rhetoric

Rhetoric in the second century AD had become a major part of general education, defended by its practitioners as the only exponent of almost all fields of human knowledge. Schools of rhetoric flourished everywhere and rhetors were overshadowing philosophers. Beside the many 'private' schools and the numbers of pupils great rhetors would command, it is a testimony of the elevated status of the art at the time that several of the sophists were appointed to state professorships, most prestigious of which, Philostratus relates, were those of Athens and Rome. It is also revealing of the honour involved that the choice for the appointment was made by an emperor like Marcus Aurelius (who had chosen the first incumbent of the school in Athens, a certain Theodotus, with a salary of 10,000 drachmas) or a figure of the stature of Herodes Atticus.¹⁰

As the second century moved on, the antagonism was becoming more acute, and philosophy seemed to be winning some very notable followers, even among pupils of rhetorical schools and indeed advocates of as high a rank as the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, attracted by the Stoic promises for the serene and unperturbed life of the philosopher. But rhetoric had not lost its dominance, as is evident from the works of Hermogenes and Philostratus, and philosophy's battles against its opponent carried the same bitterness as in the initial Platonic affront of *Gorgias*. Indeed the controversy was shaped by a long tradition and its content was determined by that tradition which had philosophy on the attack challenging the pretences of a rising discipline to be a genuine

¹⁰ Walden 1912: 130-94; cf. Kennedy 1972: 565. Professors of Platonism, Stoicism, Aristotelianism and Epicureanism were also appointed at the same time, the choice being made by Herodes Atticus.

and teachable art that could be useful both to its pupils and to society. Old arguments were recalled from the received stock of the tradition and were employed in one way or another in defence or demolition of rhetoric in the contemporary scene of the Second Sophistic.

When Aristides, in the *Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς* (and the *Ὑπὲρ τῶν Τεττάρων*) embarks on defending rhetoric against the philosophers' polemic, his arguments could be equally answering Plato in the fifth century but at the same time could be seen to be directly crossing swords with his contemporary Sextus Empiricus and his well constructed attack in *Adversus Mathematicos*. Indeed, long before Karadimas' brilliant exposition of Aristides' defence of rhetoric as a point by point dialogue with Sextus,¹¹ whom most probably Aristides never met and to whose work he does not refer, the confrontation between the two combatants in the wider 'philosophy *vs* rhetoric' controversy was noted, the argument being drawn from the identical order of the main questions in Aristides and Sextus: First the definition of rhetoric, then its material, finally its applications. The similarity is due certainly to the fact that they both draw their arguments from the long tradition, in which they find finely crafted *argumentatio* and which, they know, also arms the current attacks of their rivals. In fact, observing this tantalising similarity in the structure of their argument, Michel does not hesitate to attribute it to the traditional character of the various questions and their sequence.¹²

3. Aristides and his contemporary schools of philosophy

Insofar as rhetoric was claiming to impart knowledge, the Sceptics could see in its ambitious educational pretensions a legitimate target as being yet another exponent of Dogmatism. However, as Karadimas argues,¹³ this forms only a minor part of Sextus' arguments. Although Sextus uses typical sceptical arguments,¹⁴ he goes far beyond this and seems to be representing the whole of philosophy against the accusations of the orators. He takes the side of philosophy against a spurious art, as Plato did long before him and in this, he invokes arguments from the wider philosophical position against rhetoric. In this, Sextus appears to echo a common element in all critics of rhetoric during the era of the Second Sophistic: a strong commitment or at least sympathy towards philosophy the defence of which they undertake against an opponent.

Karadimas is of the view, with Behr, that Aristides is not actually answering Plato, but, through his measuring up against the giant figure of the past, and originator as it were of the arguments against rhetoric, he is fighting off a recent attack directed against his art by

¹¹ Karadimas 1996.

¹² Michel 1993: 529.

¹³ Karadimas 1996: 32.

¹⁴ As when he assumes the Stoic definition of 'what art is' to show that rhetoric does not fulfil this definition.

contemporary Cynics who had launched their criticism using Platonic arguments. The intensified controversy had eventually drawn in Platonists (the middle Platonists of Pergamum whom Behr questionably identifies with the 'phantom' school of Caius)¹⁵ and Karadimas sees Aristides' oration *Πρὸς Καπίτωνα* as an attempt to respond to their accusations that he had made a personal attack against Plato with his reference to his trip to Sicily; also some passages of the *Or. II* (§§ 12, 60, 272, 440) show that Aristides may have thought his *Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς* as an answer, at least in part, to the same Platonists.¹⁶

But how is Aristides disposed towards philosophy? In his polemical treatises against philosophy's onslaught, mainly his defence of rhetoric in *Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς* (and less in the more historical arguments of the *Ὑπὲρ τῶν Τεττάρων*) he exemplifies a vast erudition and seems widely conversant with philosophy. He is able to answer most of philosophy's charges against oratory showing acute logical rigour: he enters the fields of philosophy trying to defend his discipline in terms of the arguments philosophy levels against it.

Michel¹⁷ thinks that the debate between Aristides and Sextus is a continuation of the dispute between Scepticism and Platonism, in which the question of eloquence was involved. He believes that Aristides owes much to Platonism and that while refuting Scepticism he makes a conscious attempt to reconcile Sophistic and the Platonic philosophy, particularly exploiting the opportunities *Phaedrus* offers for this task¹⁸. It is an attempt, argues Michel, made much easier by the advent of eclecticism and syncretism which tends to prevail in the second century. The acceptance of eloquence, asserts Michel, distances Aristides from the Cynics, as well as the Stoics, and Epictetus, but does not break his link with the philosophers.¹⁹

Michel's rather narrow philosophical point of view may not satisfy scholars like Karadimas, who is impatient with interpreters who fail to see the contribution Aristides' *Ὑπὲρ ῥητορικῆς* is making in his contemporary discussion, placing it in a more

¹⁵. Behr 1968a: 12, 54n. 50; for the way Platonists were irritated by Aristides' answer, *ibid.* 59-60. Dillon (1996: 266-340, see esp. 338-40), has convincingly shaken the old conviction over the existence of this "phantom" school that is supposed to have created a doctrinal tradition in Pergamum.

¹⁶. See particular *Or. II.440*: εἰπέ δὴ μοι πρὸς θεῶν, εἴτε Πλάτων εἴτε ἄλλος τις ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου βούλεται; Karadimas also reads several passages in the *Or. III* as indicating a preemptive answer to possible criticisms by the Platonists of his time.

¹⁷. Michel 1993: 5-29, esp. 26-7.

¹⁸. Trapp (1990b: 166-7) exposes the "cheeky and self-assertive reuse of the *Phaedrus*" by Aristides, in support of his own views and values, and considers it as characteristic of more than one oration. The orator is presented to engage in double-dealing with the philosopher, by criticising and correcting him on the one hand while appropriating on the other hand his some of Plato's standing for his own benefit. More significant is the use Aristides makes of Plato's argument in *Phaedrus* regarding the 'beneficial madness' which is turned by the orator against Plato's attack against rhetoric in *Gorgias*. To use the opponents own words in order to show his inconsistency is a tool of the orator's trade.

¹⁹. The rivalry between rhetoric and philosophy may have been acute and unremitting; however channels of communication always existed. Anderson (1993: 135) succinctly points to them: "the common heritage of Plato, as accomplished a prose literature as a philosopher; a place in the rhetorician's curriculum at least for the exhibition of *paideia*, with room for parading not only knowledge of doctrines but of lives of philosophers; and in turn a tendency towards 'display philosophy' in some sense".

systematic way in the context of his contemporary controversy between rhetoric and philosophy.²⁰ This may be so, and Karadimas may be indeed insightful with his understanding of the place 'Υπερ ρητορικῆς has in the intellectual map of its time – and in particular in the on-going rivalry between philosophy and rhetoric to which he so substantially contributes. However, Michel's philosophical analysis is on the other hand very enlightening in showing the philosophical points of view of the orator who, as an erudite all-rounder intellectual, understandably finds it difficult to divide himself between philosophical theory and rhetorical practice. His arguments betray Platonic elements as when he distinguishes between the true and genuine art of eloquence and the spurious kind, in accordance as it were with the (Platonic) thesis that a notion is more true and genuine the closer it is to its formal idea. Michel also finds a distinct Socratic element in the very idea of conciliation (although this argument begs the question).

What is indisputable however, is that Aristides follows the Isocratean line in that he has a grander view of his art, distinguishing himself from the lesser activities of extemporary orations, and instead directing his efforts to princely declamations. He takes even more seriously his own devotion to his art, attributing his decision to serve it to a divine call, Asclepius' encouragement to embark on this career (as explained in his *Hieroi Logoi*).²¹

Aristides however does not hide his admiration for Plato, from whom he often draws in other speeches, and whose work he admires also for its literary value – although, as he states, he cannot accept his criticism of rhetoric. Along with other sophists, he was also attracted to Plato's philosophical idealism — indeed, the sophist's exposition of Platonism in a popular form is considered to have paved the way for the emergence of Neoplatonism in the following century. Neoplatonists took his reply to Plato very seriously, and, according to the lexicon Souda, Porphyrius wrote a rejoinder to Aristides' 'Υπερ ρητορικῆς.

It was this idealistic spirit of the Platonic texts which seems to be very attractive to orators who, against the trend of the professional extemporary orators, retained for their art a nobler view, going back to Isocrates' ideas, and traces of Platonic overtures are already attested in Cicero's *de Oratore*. In a generally moribund philosophical climate, where the great schools of the past have already watered down their doctrines with eclectic compromises, Platonism, which was to fill the intellectual gap in the next two centuries, was already on the way up, mainly through the appeal of its idealistic spirit, the allure of its Attic diction to the contemporary classicists and its ready adaptability to the

²⁰. As he himself does (Karadimas 1996: 32-3), seeing the clash with Sextus not only as a clash with the sceptical position but also within the wider philosophical opposition to rhetoric. Concerning Aristides' Platonic discourses he writes: "Aristides' three Platonic discourses have their philosophical dimensions and, in this sense, they enrich the discussion between rhetoric and philosophy in the second century AD"; (see Karadimas 1996: 33).

²¹. Cf. *Hieros Logos* 4 (50).14-5.

religious zeal that begun to satisfy (through generous syncretisms which facilitated devotion to various cults) the intellectual and moral needs of Hellenism 'in the age of anxiety'.²² Stoicism, the strongest school of the age, which kept on teaching private and public morality and provided for what philosophical background was to be found in the official pagan religion, did not at the end match the assuaging promises of the quasi-fideistic fervour that was to characterise in the next two centuries the monotheistic philosophy of Neoplatonism.

²². Aristides' '*hypochondriac*' illness and his excessive devotion to various cults – suggested among others by his special relations with Asclepius – encouraged some scholars (prominent among whom was **Dodds** 1965: 39-45), to view the second century as '*the age of anxiety*'. **Swain** (1996: 106-9), rejects this opinion finding instead that views like Dodds speak more of the 'anxiety' and the 'dolour' of the age the exegete lives rather than the age he describes. He also finds little to commend or support the view that Aristides was after all an 'hypochondriac', a disease indeed which marks our times and cannot be read back in antiquity.

I. INDEX OF PINDARIC QUOTATIONS

The best classification of a passage is often difficult to determine, especially as Aristides frequently mingles direct quotation with loose paraphrase. Therefore some passages indexed as quotation will have paraphrases of nearby lines in the immediate context.

I. YMNOI (10).

Hymn. (title) = Aristid. 3,620 (1,498 L.-B.)

<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑ?>

<i>fr.</i> *31	=	Aristid. 2,420 (1,277 L.-B.)	64
<i>fr.</i> 32	=	Aristid. 3,620 (1,498 L.-B.)	77
<i>fr.</i> *33	=	Aristid. 3,620 (1,498 L.-B.)	82
<i>fr.</i> 33c.5	=	Aristid. 43(1), 2,341-2,1 K.	84
<i>fr.</i> 33c.5	=	Aristid. 44(17), 2,350,23-4 K.	86
<i>fr.</i> *33d.1-2	=	Aristid. 38(7), 2,315-6,26-1 K.	88
<i>fr.</i> *35a	=	Aristid. 43(1), 2,347,2-3 K.	71

ΕΙΣ ΠΕΡΣΕΦΟΝΗΝ / <ΕΙΣ ΤΥΧΗΝ>

<i>fr.</i> *38	=	Aristid. 3,466 (1,451 L.-B.)	186
<i>fr.</i> *38	=	Aristid. 2,112 (1,179 L.-B.)	184

Hymn. fr. 48.

<i>fr.</i> 48	=	Aristid. 3,37 (1,304 L.-B.)	229
---------------	---	-----------------------------	-------	-----

II. ΠΑΙΑΝΕΣ (3).

II. [ΑΒΔΗΡΙΤΑΙΣ]

<i>fr.</i> 52b.35	=	<i>Hieros Logos</i> 4 (50).42 K.	61
-------------------	---	----------------------------------	-------	----

VI. ΔΕΛΦΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΠΥΘΩ

<i>fr.</i> 52f.1-6	=	Aristid. 28(49), 2,160,9-13 K.	293
--------------------	---	--------------------------------	-------	-----

VII.b ΠΙ [..]ΑΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΔΗΛΟ[Ν]

<i>fr.</i> 52h.13-4	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,356,10-1 K.	52, 57
---------------------	---	-------------------------------	-------	--------

III. ΔΙΘΥΡΑΜΒΟΙ (8).

Dith. (title) = Aristid. 3,620 (1,498 L.-B.)

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣ (B' cl. v. 8)

<i>fr.</i> 75.14	=	Aristid. 20(21), 2,22,10 K.	317
<i>fr.</i> 75.14	=	Aristid. 46(3), 2,370,8-10K.	324

ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙΣ (Γ' cl. *fr.* 74 et 75, 8?)

<i>fr.</i> 76.2	=	Aristid. 1,9 (1,11 L.-B.)	145
<i>fr.</i> 76.2	=	Aristid. 1,124 (1,52 L.-B.)	145
<i>fr.</i> 76.2	=	Aristid. 1,401 (1,136 L.-B.)	138
<i>fr.</i> 76.2	=	Aristid. 8,21 (1,622-3 L.-B.)	141
<i>fr.</i> 76.2	=	Aristid. 20(21), 2,20,14-5 K.	143

II. ΚΥΑΤΑ[ΒΑΣΙΣ] ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΥ[Σ] Η ΚΕΡΒΕΡΟΣ ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ (post 470)

<i>fr.</i> 81	=	Aristid. 2,229 (1,209 L.-B.)	217
---------------	---	------------------------------	-------	-----

IV. ΚΕΧΩΡΙΣΜΕΝΑ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΕΙΩΝ (3).

<i>fr.</i> 95	=	Aristid. 3,191 (1,356 L.-B.)	117
<i>fr.</i> 95	=	Aristid. 42(6), 2,338,1-2 K.	114
<i>fr.</i> *99	=	Aristid. 41(4), 2,331,17-9 K.	102

V. ΥΠΟΡΧΗΜΑΤΑ (2).

<i>fr.</i> 108 (a)	=	Aristid. 27(16), 2,125,9 K.	299
<i>fr.</i> 108 (a)	=	Aristid. 33(51), 2,228,3 K.	304

VI. ΘΡΗΝΟΙ (2).

<i>fr.</i> 129.7	=	Aristid. 32(12), 2,225,16-9 K. 130
<i>fr.</i> *136a	=	Aristid. 31(11), 2,215,6-7 K. 126

ΕΠΙΝΙΚΟΙ**A. ΟΛΥΜΠΙΟΝΙΚΑΙΣ** (16).**I. ΙΕΡΩΝΙ ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΩΙ ΚΕΛΗΤΙ.**

26-7	=	Aristid. 21(22), 2,26,4-7 K. 153
26	=	Aristid. 20(21), 2,21,25 K. (?) 157
38-9	=	Aristid. 17(15), 2,1,20-1 K. 149
49	=	Aristid. 21(22), 2,26,4 K. 153
30ff., 44	=	Aristid. 34(50), 2,243,18 K. 256

II. ΘΗΡΩΝΙ ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΩΙ ΑΡΜΑΤΙ.

1-2	=	<i>Hieros Logos</i> 4 (50).31 K. 61
86-8	=	Aristid. 2,109 (1,178 L.-B.) 171
86-8	=	Aristid. 28(49), 2,159,13-5 K. 283

III. ΘΗΡΩΝΙ ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΩΙ ΑΡΜΑΤΙ (ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣΕΝΙΑ).

11ff.	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,353,11-2 K. 52, 57
-------	---	-------------------------------	--------------

VI. ΑΓΗΣΙΑΙ ΣΥΡΑΚΟΥΣΙΩΙ ΑΠΗΝΗΙ.

43, 50	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,353,12 K. 52, 57
--------	---	-----------------------------	--------------

VII. ΔΙΑΓΟΡΑΙ ΡΟΔΙΩΙ ΠΥΚΤΗΙ.

7	=	Aristid. 39(18), 2,324,1 K. 97
49-50	=	Aristid. 25(43), 2,80,12-4 K. 265
54-5, 57, 67-8	=	Aristid. 25(43), 2,80,5-8 K. 264
58, 62, 65, 68	=	Aristid. 24(44), 2,69,4-6 K. 268

IX. ΕΦΑΡΜΟΣΤΩΙ ΟΠΟΥΝΤΙΩΙ ΠΑΛΛΙΣΤΗΙ.

26	=	Aristid. 30(10), 2,207,3-4 K. 132
27-9	=	Aristid. 2,110 (1,179 L.-B.) 181
100-2	=	Aristid. 2,110 (1,179 L.-B.) 178

B. ΠΥΘΙΟΝΙΚΑΙΣ (7).**II. ΙΕΡΩΝΙ ΑΡΜΑΤΙ.**

94-5	=	Aristid. 2,230 (1,209 L.-B.) 223
96	=	Aristid. 2,230 (1,209 L.-B.) 223

III. ΙΕΡΩΝΙ ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΩΙ.

43	=	Aristid. 17(15), 2,2,6-7 K. 160
83	=	Aristid. 34(50), 2,239,7 K. 251

VI. ΞΕΝΟΚΡΑΤΕΙ ΑΚΡΑΓΑΝΤΙΝΩΙ ΑΡΜΑΤΙ.

11ff.	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,356,11 K. 52, 57
-------	---	-----------------------------	--------------

VIII. ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΕΙ ΑΙΓΙΝΗΤΗΙ ΠΑΛΛΙΣΤΗΙ.

95	=	Aristid. 2,148 (1,189 L.-B.) 189
----	---	------------------------------	-----------

IX. ΤΕΛΕΣΙΚΡΑΤΕΙ ΚΥΡΗΝΑΙΩΙ ΟΠΛΙΤΟΔΡΟΜΩΙ.

95?	=	Aristid. 23(42), 2,41,23K. 272
-----	---	----------------------------	-----------

Γ. ΙΣΘΜΙΟΝΙΚΑΙΣ (2).

III. <ΜΕΛΗΣΣΩΙ ΘΗΒΑΙΩΙ ΙΠΠΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΩ> .			
70	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,353,13? K.	52, 57
VIII. <ΚΛΕΑΝΔΡΩΙ ΑΙΓΙΝΗΤΗΙ ΠΑΙΔΙ ΠΑΓΚΡΑΤΙΩ> .			
61	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,356,10-1 K.	52, 57

INCERTORUM LIBRORUM (11).

<Ἀθηνᾶ>			
fr. 146	=	Aristid. 37(2), 2,305,22-3K.	92
<Νόμος Βασιλεύς>			
fr. 169a.1-8	=	Aristid. 2,226-8 (1,208-9 L.-B.)	210
fr. 169a.16-7	=	Aristid. 2,229 (1,209 L.-B.)	220
fr. 182	=	Aristid. 34(50), 2,238,11-2 K.	248
<ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ>			
fr. 194	=	Aristid. 28(49), 2,159,25-7&3-5K.	288
fr. 201	=	Aristid. 36(48), 2,298,27-8 K.	330
fr. 226	=	Aristid. 34(50), 2,238,10 K.	243
fr. 237	=	Aristid. 28(49), 2,159,21-2 K.	285
Π¹³ (P. Harr. 21)			
fr. 260	=	Aristid. 3,478 (1,456 L.-B.)	235
fr. 283?	=	Aristid. 41(4), 2,331,19-21 K.	111
fr. 329	=	Aristid. 26(14), 2,91,11 K.	310

DVBIA (6).

fr. 350	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,353,10 K.	52, 57
fr. 351	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,353,11 K.	52, 57
fr. 352	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,353,14 K.	52, 57
fr. 353	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,353,14-5 K.	52, 57
fr. 354	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,356,10 K.	52, 57
fr. 355	=	Aristid. 45(8), 2,356,11 K.	52, 57

Name References to Pindar (21)

1. Aristid. 31(11), 2,212,10 K.
2. Aristid. 28(49), 2,161,14 K.
3. Aristid. 32(12), 2,225,16 K.
4. Aristid. 32(12), 2,222,28ff. K.
5. Aristid. 2,109 (1,178 L.-B.)
6. Aristid. 2,110 (1,178 L.-B.)
7. Aristid. 2,112 (1,179 L.-B.)
8. Aristid. 2,148 (1,189 L.-B.)
9. Aristid. 2,226 (1,208 L.-B.)
10. Aristid. 2,229 (1,209 L.-B.)
11. Aristid. 2,230 (1,209 L.-B.)
12. Aristid. 2,231 (1,210 L.-B.)
13. Aristid. 2,420 (1,277 L.-B.)
14. Aristid. 3,37 (1,304 L.-B.)
15. Aristid. 3,191 (1,356 L.-B.)
16. Aristid. 3,238 (1,373 L.-B.)
17. Aristid. 3,466 (1,451 L.-B.)
18. Aristid. 3,478 (1,456 L.-B.)
19. Aristid. 3,478 (1,456 L.-B.)
20. Aristid. 3,620 (1,498 L.-B.)
21. Aristid. 4,27 (1,538 L.-B.)

2. DISTRIBUTION OF PINDARIC QUOTATIONS IN ARISTIDES' ORATIONS IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

DATE / PLACE	ORATION (§§)	PINDAR	Pindar's name	ARISTIDES' TEXT (introductory phrases)
I. AD 141 — 145				
142 (early)	XXV.29	<i>Ol.</i> VII. 54-5, 57, 67-8	—	καὶ τὰ μὲν πρόσθεν λεγόμενα ταῦτα [μυθολογήματα] ἦν, ὅτι τήνδε τὴν νῆσον...
	28	48	—	ταῖς πρόσθεν ἱερομηνίαις ἀντίστροφοι
	30	49-50	Π	καὶ Πίνδαρος παραλαβὼν ὕσαι χρυσόν...
142 April 25 (Smyrna)	XLV. 3	<i>fr.</i> 350 <i>fr.</i> 351 <i>Ol.</i> III.11ff. <i>Ol.</i> VI.43, 50 <i>Isth.</i> III.70 <i>fr.</i> 352 <i>fr.</i> 353	[π]	δυεῖν στροφαῖν ἢ περίοδοι ἀπεπλήρωσαν τὸ πᾶν. καὶ Δᾶλον ἀμφιρύταν εἰπόντες ἢ 'Δία τερπικέραυνον' ἢ 'πόντον ἐρίβρομον', καὶ παρελθόντες ὡς 'Ἡρακλῆς εἰς Ὑπερβορέους ἀφίκετο καὶ ὡς 'Ἴαμος ἦν μάντις παλαιὸς ἢ ὡς τὸν 'Ἀνταῖον 'Ἡρακλῆς, ἢ Μίνωα, ἢ 'Ραδάμανθυν προσθέντες ἢ Φάσιν, ἢ 'Ἰστρον, ἢ ὡς αὐτοὶ 'θρέμματα Μουσῶν' εἰσι καὶ δμαχοὶ τινες εἰς σοφίαν ἀναφθεγξάμενοι, αὐτάρκως σφίσιν ὑμνήσθαι νομίζουσιν, καὶ οὐδὲ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν οὐδεὶς πλέον ἐπιζητεῖ παρ' αὐτῶν.
	13	<i>fr.</i> 354 <i>fr.</i> 52h.13-4 <i>Isth.</i> VIII.61 <i>fr.</i> 355 <i>Pyth.</i> VI.11ff.	π	πολλὰ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχει πλεονεκτήματα καὶ εἰσιν αὐτοκράτορες ὅ τι ἂν βούλωνται ποιεῖν. ἡμῖν δὲ οὔτε ἀνοῖξαι πῖθον ὕμνων οὐθ' 'ἄρμα μουσαῖον' οὐθ' 'ὀλκάδα μυριοφόρον' οὔτε νεφέλας.... οὐ γρῦπας οὐδὲ τῶν τοιούτων οὐδὲν ἐξεστὶν εἰπεῖν, οὔτε θρασύνασθαι οὐτ' ἐπεμβαλεῖν λόγον ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος.
II. AD 145 — 147 (Cathedra)				
Cathedra (Pergamum)	XLI. 6	<i>fr.</i> *99	Π	ὡς Πίνδαρός τε ὕμνεῖ καὶ οἱ κατ' Αἴγυπτον ἱερεῖς κατέμαθον....
	6	<i>fr.</i> 283	—	.. καὶ μὴν καὶ τὴν Ἥραν λέγουσιν ὡς...
Cathedra (Pergamum)	XXVIII.55	<i>Ol.</i> II.86-8	—	Φέρε δὴ γνῶρισον καὶ ταῦτα, εἰ ἄρα οἷός τε εἰ' ...
	56	<i>fr.</i> 237	Π	πάλιν τοῖνυν πρὸς τινα τῶν ἀκροατῶν.... οὕτως πεποίηκεν
	57	<i>fr.</i> 194	[Π]	ἄκουε δὴ καὶ ἐτέρων...
	58	<i>Pae.</i> VI.1-6	[Π]	ἐτέρωθι δὲ ἔτι λαμπρότερον...
Cathedra (Pergamum)	II. 109	<i>Ol.</i> II.86-8	Π	'Ἐτι τοῖνυν ἐνός ποιητοῦ τῶν ἀπὸ Βοιωτίας καὶ Ἑλικῶνος παρασχέσσομαι μαρτυρίαν.... ὡς ἀληθῶς βοᾷ Στεντόρειον εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὥσπερ σιωπὴν κηρύξας
	110	<i>Ol.</i> IX.100-2	[Π]	ἐτέρωθι δ' αὖ βραχύτερον μὲν, γνωρίμως δ' οὐχ ἥττον διαμαρτύρεται...
	110	<i>Ol.</i> IX.27-9	[Π]	καὶ ἔτι πρὸ τούτων...
	112	<i>fr.</i> *38	[Π]	οὐκ ἔξω δ' ἴσταται τῆς ὅλης μαρτυρίας οὐδὲ τότε
	148	<i>Pyth.</i> VIII.95	Π	ῶστε σοι τὸ τοῦ μορίου εἰδῶ-λον σκιᾶς δυναρ εἰς ἔλεγχον κατὰ Πίνδαρον γίγνεται.
	226-8	<i>fr.</i> 169a.1-8	Π	οὐ τὸν Πινδάρου νόμον τιμῶσα, ὡ τάναντία αὐτὰ λέγων τῇ φύσει τῆς ρητορικῆς, οὐδὲ ταῦτ' ἐπάδουσα «Νόμος...
	229	<i>fr.</i> 81	Π	δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Πίνδαρος, εἰ τι δεῖ περὶ τοῦ ἄσματος εἰπεῖν.... τεκμαίρομαι ἐργοῖσιν Ἡρακλέος αὐτοῖς τούτοις, ὅτι καὶ ἐτέρωθι μεμνημένος περὶ αὐτῶν ἐν διθυράμβῳ τινί.
	229	<i>fr.</i> 169a.16-7	[Π]	οὐ γὰρ εἰκός, φησὶν, ἀρπαζομένων ...
	230	<i>Pyth.</i> II.94-5	Π	οὐκ ἦν ἐπαινεῖν πρὸς Πινδάρου, οὐδὲ συμβουλεύειν πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν.
	230	<i>Pyth.</i> II.96	Π	αὐτὸς γοῦν τὸ τοιοῦτον κέκληκεν «Ὀλισθηρόν οἶμον» καὶ κελεύει φυλάττεσθαι.
	420	<i>fr.</i> *31	Π	Πίνδαρος δὲ τοσαύτην ὑπερβολὴν ἐποίησατο ῶστε ἐν Διὸς γάμῳ

1. 'Π': indicates that Pindar's name is stated; 'π': indicates vague authority; '—': Pindar's words are cited without attribution to Pindar.

147 January (Pergamum)	XXX.16	Ol. IX.26+Eur.	—	Πῶς δ' οὐχὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος αὐτοῦ τὸ πρέμνον, καὶ μάλ' ἐν ἀκηράτοις...
147 August (Pergamum)	XXXVIII.12	fr. *33d.1-2	π	Ἀπόλλω τε γάρ φασιν οἱ ποιηταὶ τὴν Δῆλον
III. AD 147 — 153				
147/149 (Smyrna)	XXXVI.112	fr. 201	Π	αὐτίκα Πινδάρῳ πεποιήται, ὅσ-περ μάλιστ' ἀληθείας ἀντέ-χεσθαι... φησὶ γὰρ Ἀίγυπτιαν
149 (Smyrna)	XLIII. 13 3 0	fr. 33c.5	—	τῆς τε φιλοτεχνίας τὰ κράτιστα ἐνταῦτα τοῦτ' εἰσηνέγκατο, κοσμήσας μὲν...
		fr. *35a	Π	τοῦτο γὰρ οὖν Πινδάρῳ κάλλιον ἢ ἄλλ' ὅτιοῦν ὁτῶν εἴρηται περὶ Διός.
149 (Smyrna)	XXIV. 50	Ol. VII. 58, 62, 65, 68	—	ὅτ' ἐκ τῆς θαλάττης ἀνῆει δῶρον τῷ θεῷ:
c. 150 (Smyrna)	XXXII.34	fr. 129.7	Π	εἰ δὲ ἀληθεῖς οἱ Πινδάρου λόγοι καὶ Πλάτωνος καὶ παντὸς τοῦ περὶ Ἀλέξανδρον ἐργαστηρίου
153 January (Baris)	XXXVII.6	fr. 146	Π	Πίνδαρος δ' αὐ φησιν δεξιάν
IV. AD 154 — 164				
155 (Delus)	XLIV.14	fr. 33c.5	—	ὥσπερ δὲ οὐρανὸς τοῖς ἀστροῖς κεκόσμηται, οὕτω καὶ τὸ τοῦ Αἰγαίου πέλαγος ταῖς νήσοις κεκόσμηται.
155 August (Athens)	I. 9 124 401	fr. 76.2	—	ὅτι τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐστὶν ἔρυμα
		fr. 76.2	—	ἀντέσχευ ὥσπερ ἔρυμα καὶ πρόβολος.
		fr. 76.2	—	πρότερον μὲν οὖν ἡγάμην ἀκούων...τὴν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἐστίαν καὶ τὸ ἔρεισμα καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἤδετο....
155 late (Rome)	XXVI. 1	fr. 329	—	ποιητῆς μὲν οὖν ἤδη τις εἶπε σκώψας εὐξασθαι 'κατά...
156 summer (SCorinth)	XLVI.25	fr.75.14	—	τοῦτ' εἶναι, καὶ τέμενος Νυμφῶν... καὶ θάλαμον ὠρῶν.
157 March 3 (Smyrna)	XVII. 3 4	Ol. I.38-9	π	οὕτω δ' ἦν ἐξ ἀρχῆς θεοφιλῆς ὥστε λέγουσιν οἱ ποιηταὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἅμα
		Pyth. III.43	π	τρίτῳ δέ, ὥς οἱ ποιηταὶ καλοῦσιν, βήματι κινηθεῖσα ἡ πόλις
161 (Cyzicus)	XXXI.12	fr. *136a	Π	ἐπέρχεται μοι τὸ τοῦ Πινδάρου προσθεῖναι, 'ἄστρο... πόντου' τὴν ἁωρίαν τὴν σὴν ἀνακαλεῖ.
161-165 (Smyrna)	III. 37 191 238 466 478 620 620	fr. 48	Π	καὶ πέπονθας ταῦτόν τῳ Πινδάρου Πηλεῖ, ὃς τῆς τε θήρας διήμαρτεν...
		fr. 95	Π	οἶμαι δ' ἔγωγε καὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα καὶ τὸν Πᾶνα... Μιλτιάδην μάρτυρας... καὶ φέρειν οὐκ ἐλάττω τοῦτο Μιλτιάδην φιλοτιμίαν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν πολιτείαν ἢ Πινδάρῳ φασὶν εἰς τὴν μουσικὴν τὸ τὸν αὐτόν τοῦτον θεὸν ὀρχήσασθαι...
		fr. 77	Π	οὔτε λόγους ἀσχήμονας εἰπὼν οἶμαι πρὸς τοὺς ἐμπλέοντας Ἀθηναίων... ἀλλ', ὥς φησι Πίνδαρος, κρηπίδα...
		fr. *38	Π	ἀλλὰ κάνταῦθα τὸ τοῦ Πινδάρου κρατεῖ. πάνν γὰρ μετ' ἀληθείας τοῦτ' ἐκεῖνος ὕμνησεν' "" "" ""
		fr. 260	Π	καίτοι τίς οὐκ ἂν φήσειεν οὕτως πολλὴν εἶναι τὴν ἀλογίαν, ὄντα μὲν αὐτὸν κυριώτερον..., ὥς ἔφη Πίνδαρος.
		fr. 32	Π	οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τῶν Πινδάρου διθυράμβων ὅτι χρή καταγνώσκειν τοιοῦτον οἶον Πλάτων ἐπητιάσατο ... ἀλλ' ὅτι κάν τοῖς ὕμνοις διεξιῶν περὶ τῶν ἐν ἅπαντι τῳ χρόνῳ συμβαινόντων παθημάτων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς τὸν Κάδμον φησὶν ἀκοῦσαι τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος μουσικὰν ὀρθάν ἐπιδεικνυμένου. οὕτω καὶ Πίνδαρος τῆς ὀρθῆς μουσικῆς ἐραστής ἐστίν.
		fr. 33	Π	
V. AD 165 — 189				
166 Sept (Cyzicus)	XXVII. 2	fr. 108a	Π	ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἔφη Πίνδαρος, θεοῦ δείξαντος ἀρχὴν οὐδὲν δὴ τὸ κωλύον...
late Sept. (Laneion)	XXXIII.1	fr. 108a	Π	θεοῦ δέ, φησὶν Πίνδαρος, δείξαντος ἀρχὴν εὐθεῖα δὴ κέλευθος ἐλεῖν τὸ προκείμενον.
167 Jan. 3 (Pergamum)	XXIII. 36	Pyth. IX.95?	Π	ἐλαφρὰ γάρ, φασί, χάρις ἡ τῆς εὐφημίας. ὥστε μηδὲ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς δεῖν ἀποστερεῖν τοῦ τοιοῦτου χρηστοῦ γέ τι πράξαντας θεῶν τινος εἶναι παραίνεσιν Ἡρακλεῖ Πίνδαρος, οἶμαι, λέγει.

167 Jan. 3 (Pergamum)	XXXIX.16	Ol. VII.7	Π	καὶ οὐτ' ἂν γάλα παραβάλοις οὐτ' ἂν οἶνον ποθήσαιοις, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὥσπερ Πίνδαρος τὸ νέκταρ ἐποίησεν αὐτόχυτον, πότιμον...
170 January (Smyrna)	XXXIV. 5	fr. 226	Π	ἀλλ' οὐ.... Πλάτων καὶ Πίνδαρος πολλαχὴ μὲν καὶ ἄλλη σοφοί, καὶ δὴ καὶ κατὰ τόνδε τὸν λόγον οὐχ ἥκιστα, ὁ μὲν οὕτως λέγων 'Οὐτὶς ἐκὼν κακὸν εὔρετο'
	5	fr. 182	[Π]	καὶ πάλιν ὀρμηθεὶς ἐκ τῶν περὶ τῆς Ἐριφύλης λόγων 'ὦ πόποι, φησὶν οἷ' ἀπατάται φροντὶς ἐπαμερίων οὐκ εἰδυῖα'. ὁ δ' ἄνω καὶ κάτω δήπου διορίζεται καὶ δείκνυσιν τὰ ἀμαρτήματα...
	8	Pyth. III.83	[Π]	οὐκ οὐκ δ' γ' αὐτὸς ποιητὴς, οὐ μικρῶ πρόσθεν ἐμνήσθη. ἔφη τὰ καλὰ τρέπειν...
	25	Ol. I.30ff., 44	π	διὸ τῶν μὲν αἰσχροῶν οὐ φασὶν ἔρωτα εἶναι, τῶν δὲ καλῶν κἂν θεοὶς εἶναι ποιηταὶ λέγουσιν.
171 (Lanceion)	Hieros Logos 4. 3 ¹	Ol. II.1-2	—	'Φορμύγγων ἀνακτα Παιῖνα κληίσω'
	4 ²	fr. 52b.35	—	'Ἰὴ Παιῖν "Ἡρακλῆς Ἀσκληπιέ'
177 January (Pergamum)	XLII.12	fr. 95	Π	τὸ γὰρ τοῦ Πινδάρου μετέβαλες· ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ ὁ Πᾶν τὸν παιῖνα ὥρχησατο, ὥς λόγος, ἐγὼ δέ, εἰ θέμις εἰπεῖν, ὦν..... ὑποκριτὴς εἶναι·
178 January (Lanceion)	XX. 13	fr. 76.2	—	οὐδένες οὐτε μείζονα οὐτε ἐλάττονα ἀπεμνημόνευσαν χάριν τῶν ἐκ τοῦ παντός αἰῶνος εὐεργεσιῶν, οὐδ' ὅτι τοῦ γένους ἔρεισμα ἡ πόλις ἦδετο.
	19	[Ol. I.26]		ἡ πόλις δὲ ὥσπερ ἐν δράματι καὶ δὴ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀναφύεται μεταβαλοῦσα τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἡ αὐτὴ παλαιὰ καὶ νέα γενομένη, ὥσπερ τὸν φοῖνικα
	21	fr. 75.14	—	ἦρος δὲ πύλαι καὶ θέρους ὑπὸ στεφάνων ἀνοίγνυνται, χοροὶ δὲ Νυμφῶν καὶ Μουσῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τε καὶ περὶ αὐτὴν χορεύουσι, ζέφυροι...
179 March 3 (Lanceion)	XXI.10	Ol. I.49	π	οἶσθ' ὅτι φασὶν οἱ ποιηταὶ τὸν Πέλοπα κατὰ μέλη τμηθέντα ἐψηθέντα ἐν λέβητι συντεθῆναι πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ τοῦ λέβητος, (contin.)
	10	Ol. I.26-7	π	ἐλλείποντος δὲ τοῦ ὤμου σχεῖν ἐλεφάντινον ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ φασὶ τὸ ἔργον Δήμητρος γενέσθαι· ὥς δὲ καὶ τῇ πόλει μετ' ἐκείνον τὸν λέβητα,

<i>Incerti</i>		<i>Temporis</i>		
	VIII.21	fr. 76.2	—	μηδαμῶς, ὦ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, μὴ τοὺς βαρβάρους μιμώμεθα, μηδ', ἣν ἔρεισμα τῆς Ἑλλάδος πόλιν ἤδομεν, ταύτην ἀνατρέψωμεν.

3. General Index of quotations in Aristides*

* (Quotations from Pindar and Plato are excluded from the following list, which are given independently in the introduction. Name-references to the below listed authors are also excluded. The quotations from *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are given as a total; for details for these quotations cf. the index in C.A. Behr, vol. I (1986), and vol. II (1981), s.v. Homer).

1. EPIC POETS

Homerus

Il. 253 quotes
Od. 93 quotes

Hesiodus

Th. 11 XXVIII.20
Th. 22 XXVIII.20
Th. 30 II.100
Th. 30 XXVIII.22
Th. 30-1 XXVIII.23
Th. 31 XXVIII.23
Th. 32 XXVIII.24
Th. 38 XXVIII.24
Th. 80ff. XX.8; XXXIV.42
Th. 80-7 II.391
Th. 88-90 II.391
Th. 595 III.664
Th. 703-4 XXV.39
Th. 736ff. XXVI.13
Op. 5 XXVI.39
Op. 11-4 XXIV.13
Op. 17-24 XXX.3
Op. 26 XXXII.11
Op. 36 XLII.2
Op. 122-3 III.188
Op. 181 XXVI.106
Op. 218 XLVIII.72
Op. 293, 295-7 II.97
Op. 304 III.664
Op. 493 III.70
Op. 699 II.129
Op. 763-4 III.123
fr. 23 R II.423
Eoae fr. 116 Rzach XXVIII.18

Hymnus Homericus III

III. 132 XLIII.25
III. 166-78 XXVIII.19
III. 169-72 XXXIV.35

Cypria

fr. 4 (Ox ed.) XXXII.25
XLIV.16

Nosti

(if not *Od.* 3.103ff; 117) XLVI.18

Aratus

Phaenom. 2 XLIII.26; XLV.30
Phaenom. 33 XLIII.8

2. LYRIC POETS

Alcaeus

fr. 23 B III.298
fr. 35.10 D=112 LP XXIII.68
fr. 35.10 D XXV.64
fr. 112B II.464

Alcman

fr. 30P=7B=10D=30PMGF XXVIII.51
fr. 56 P=34 B=56 PMGF XLI.7

fr. 106 P=47 B=106 PMGF XXVIII.54
fr. 107 P=27 B=107 PMGF II.129
fr. 108 P=116B=108PMGF III.294
fr. 148 P=118B=148₀PMGF XXVIII.54
fr. 164 P=115B=164PMGF III.82

Archilochus

fr. 7 D and 8 D III.611
fr. 24 D and 88 D III.611
fr. 81 D III.664; III.676
fr. 84 D ? II.166 (schol.cite Eur.fr.1110 N.²)
fr. 88 D III.611
fr. 144 B=144 Ed II.406

Arion

II.336, 376

Philoxenus

III.391

Sappho

fr. 34 LP I.11
fr. 193 LP XXVIII.51
fr. 196 LP XVIII.4

Semonides

fr. 1 D II.166

Simonides

fr. 34 B=24 Ed=23 P XXXI.2
fr. 66 B=38D=77P III.97

Solon

fr. 2 D III.549
Elegies fr. 5 D XXIV.14
fr. 23.21-2 D XXVIII.137
fr. 24.3-22 D XXVIII.138
fr. 24.22-27 D XXVIII.140
frs. 24 and 25 D III.546

Stesichorus

Palinode III.557; IV.8
fr. 15 P=32 B=192 PMGF II.234 cf. I.128, 166
fr. 64 P=46 B=241 PMGF XXXIII.2

Terpander

III.231

Timocreon

III.612

3. EPIGRAMS

Parrhasius

Epigramm XXVIII.88

Simonides

fr. 46 B=88 Ed=29a,b P XXVIII.67
fr. 60 B=testim. p.258 Ed XXVIII.67
fr. 90 B=117 Ed XXVIII.63; cf. AP Epigr. 25
fr. 91 B=91 D=118 Ed XXVIII.65
fr. 97 B=124 Ed XXVIII.66
fr. 104 B=131 Ed XXVIII.63
fr. 129B=157-8 Ed III.151
fr. 132 B=161 Ed XXVIII.64; cf. AP 6.343
fr. 142 B=103b D=171 Ed III.140, 141; XXVIII.64
fr. 146B=78D=175Ed=89W XXVIII.60

Zeuxis

Zeuxis Epigram XXVIII.89

4. ORPHICA

fr. 245,1; 247,1; 334 K III.50

5. ANONYMOUS POETS

Brg III. p.684ff. XLVII.30

scolio
scolio vol.3, p.566 Ed

III.79
XXXI.19

6. TRAGIC POETS

Aeschylus

Pers. 69 I.203
Pr. 378 II.412
Th. 1 L.89
Th. 43 IV.6
fr. 135 N (*Myrmidons*) II.55; III.424
fr. 181a R (*Palamedes*) III.479
fr. 296 N III.607
fr. 300 N XXXVI.15
fr. 388 N XXXVII.29
fr. *incert* XXXVI.53

Sophocles

Aj. 301 III.672
Aj. 1313 III.395
Aj. 1353 XXIII.71
OT 257 XXV.16
OT 462 XXVIII.11
OT 614 II.408
OC 267 III.376
OC 309 IV.1
Ph. 174 XL.14
Ph. 263 XXVIII.130
Ph. 1217 XXVIII.37
fr. 13 N III.585
Satyri ('ΕΑΙΝΗΣ γάμος)/*fr.* 183-6N III.665
fr. 402 N XXII.11
fr. 667 N I.60; XX 12
fr. 685 N III.672

Euripides

Andr. 629 III.665
Antiop. (gen.) II.394
Antiop. XXVII.31
Hel. 1-3 XXXVI.13
Heracl. 178 XXX.7
Hipp. 76-7 XXX.16
Hipp. 352 II.55; III.633
IT 407 XXXIII.2
Med. 1078-80 XXXIV.50
Ph. 3 XLVII.22
Ph. 110-11 XXVI.84
Polyidus III.664
Protesilaus III.365
Tr. 1 XLIV.1
Tr. 2-3 XLIV.9
fr. 114 N XXVIII.117
fr. 381 N XXXVI.18
fr. 452 N. (*Cresphontes*) III.267
fr. 484 N II.132
fr. 663 N XXVI.3; XLI.11
fr. 710 N II.59
fr. 882N (*sic error for II. 16.391*) XLIV.1
fr. 973 N II.168
fr. 1079 N II.412
fr. 1110 N II.166
lyric verse fr. 755 P I.350

Unidentified Tragic Frs.

fr. 39 N XLII.4
fr. 40 N XXIII.71
fr. 162 N XXVII.15
fr. 317 N II.412

Av. 1334 XLII.5
Eq. (ref. to Agoracritus) III.631
Eq. 1321 XX.19
Lys. 155 III.665
Lys. 1072 III.315
Nu. (dream) LI.18
Nu. (gen. ref.) III.447
Nu. 249 III.104
Nu. 284 XLIV.1
Nu. 555 XXXIV.47
Nu. 961-5 III.155
Nu. 964 II.380
Nu. 967-9 III.155
Nu. 971-2 III.155
Nu. 983 II.380
Nu. 984-5 III.155
Nu. 993 II.115
Nu. 993-4 II.380
Nu. 995 XXXI.10
Pl. 650 XLIV.17
Ra. 91 III.65
Ra. 733 III.684
Ra. 736 XXIX.28
Ra. 785 XXXII.34
Ra. 1515 XXXII.34
Ra. 1515ff. III.466
Telmessenses I 529 CAF XLVII.16
V. 10 IV.4
V. 1019ff. XLI.11
V. 1030 XXVIII.93
V. 1043 XXVIII.93
V. 1046-47 XXVIII.94
fr. 529 K XLVII.16
fr. 643 K XXXII.32
fr. 645 B Edmonds III.133

Cratinus

fr. 215 K III.154
fr. 237 K XXVIII.92
fr. 293 K II.72; III.51
fr. 306K (error? cf. Eup.Maricas) XXVIII.92
fr. 322 K XXXIV.51

Eupolis

The Demes (paraphr.) III.365
The Demes (paraphr.) III.487
fr. 94 K III.51; XXVII.15; XXX.18
fr. 96 K III.51
Maricas XXVIII.92

Plato Comicus

fr. 1886 K III.69

Alexis

fr. 146.8 K XXXIII.16

Menander

fr. 190 K VII.5
fr. 224 K II.168
fr. 760 K III.133
fr. 940 K III.665
fr. 943 K II.237
Sententiae 313, 315, 622, 674 K II.412

Unidentified Comic Frs (CAF)

Anon. fr. 235 K L.65
fr. 471 K III.211
fr. 652 K II.392
fr. 795 K II.463

7. COMIC POETS

Aristophanes

Ach. 42 II.380
Ach. 504 XXXIII.5
Ach. 514 III.408
Ach. 530 III.124
Ach. 531 III.51
Ach. 531-33 III.79
Ach. 555 II.59
Ach. 1062 II.380
Ach. 1131 XXVIII.19
Av. 445 I.350

8. PHILOSOPHERS

Aeschines Socraticus

Alcebiades fr. 7 D III.575
fr. 8 D III.348
fr. 9 D III.576-7
fr. 11a D II.61
fr. 11b D II.62
fr. 11c D II.74
fr. 51 D II.217
P. Oxy. 1608 XXVI.10

---	XXVI.16
Anaximenes	
<i>Tricaranos</i>	XXVI.51
Antisthenes	
<i>Περί οίλου χρήσεως</i>	XLIX.33
Aristotle	
<i>Rhet.</i> 1397 a15	XXVIII.85
<i>Rhet.</i> 1397 b30	XXVIII.85
<i>Rhet.</i> 1398 a5	XXVIII.86
<i>Rhet.</i> 1411 a5	VIII.21; XI.64
<i>Ath.</i> 42.1	XXVI.37
<i>Div.Somm.</i> 463b14	II.71
Diogenes Apolloniates	
<i>fr.</i> A 18 D	XXXVI.97-9
Epedocles	
	XXVII.35
Musonius	
<i>fr.</i> 53 Hense	LII.2

9. HISTORIANS - BIOGRAPHERS

Aesopus	
<i>proverb</i>	XXXII.27
<i>fabl.</i> 24 Cham.	XVII.15
133 P	VI.16
162 Cham.	XXVI.57
185 Cham.	XXXIV.3

Anaximenes	
<i>qua</i> Theopompus <i>Tricaranos</i>	XXVI.51

Ephorus	
	XXXVI.70, 72, 77, 78, 83
Euthemenes' theory on Nile	XXXVI.85

Hecataeus	
<i>fr.</i> 308 F Jacoby	XXXVI.108

Herodotus	
<i>I.</i> 1	XXVIII.69
<i>I.</i> 8-15	II.239
<i>I.</i> 23-4	II.376
<i>I.</i> 29	III.677
<i>I.</i> 35	III.37
<i>I.</i> 65-6	I.366
<i>I.</i> 47	XXVIII.48
<i>I.</i> 91	III.686
<i>I.</i> 114	XXX.21
<i>I.</i> 137	I.303; III.460
<i>I.</i> 141	XVII.15
<i>I.</i> 165	XXVI.109
<i>I.</i> 188	XXXIX.18
<i>I.</i> 191	XXIII.69
<i>II.</i> 2	II.7
<i>II.</i> 8	XXXVI.46
<i>II.</i> 16	III.180
<i>II.</i> 19	XXXVI.114
<i>II.</i> 20	XXXVI.3
<i>II.</i> 28	XXXVI.47
	XXXVI.52, 53
<i>II.</i> 29	XXXVI.47, 51
<i>II.</i> 43	XL.10
<i>II.</i> 75	III.685
<i>II.</i> 80	III.652
<i>II.</i> 103	XXVII.38
<i>II.</i> 145	XLI.6
<i>III.</i> 78	III.390; X.37
<i>III.</i> 102	I.25
<i>III.</i> 153ff.	XXXIV.15
<i>IV.</i> 36	XXVI.28
<i>IV.</i> 95	III.677
<i>V.</i> 57	I.54
<i>V.</i> 61	I.54
<i>V.</i> 64	I.55

V. 74-8	I.91
V. 77	XXVIII.64
V. 96	III.177
V. 97-103	I.93
VI. 35-6	III.462
VI. 48	I.97
VI. 94	I.100; III.158
VI. 97	III.177
VI. 102	III.177
VI. 105	III.191
VI. 107	III.177, 181
VI. 107-17	I.105
VI. 108	XI.28
VI. 116	III.191
VI. 131	III.97, 365
VI. 136	III.207, 421
VI. 137ff.	I.55
VII. 1	III.215
VII. 3	III.177
VII. 5	VI.36
VII. 6	III.177
VII. 19	I.116
VII. 22-3	I.121
VII. 27	I.122
VII. 34	I.116
VII. 36	I.203
VII. 37	I.116
VII. 43	I.116, 120
VII. 58	I.120
VII. 59-60	I.122
VII. 101-4	III.177
VII. 109	I.120
VII. 114	XXXIV.56
VII. 118-20	III.218
VII. 228	XXVIII.65
VII. 131-3	I.97-9
VII. 132	I.320; III.219, 224
VII. 133	I.125
VII. 139	I.131
VII. 140	I.117
VII. 141	I.167; III.234, 312
VII. 144	I.23
VII. 148ff.	III.219
VII. 157ff.	III.219
VII. 160	III.218
VII. 161	I.377
VII. 165ff.	VI.51
VII. 165-7	I.232
VII. 168	III.219
VII. 172	III.219
VII. 172-4	III.177
VII. 194	I.303; III.460
VII. 209	III.177
VII. 213	III.244
VII. 226	I.122; III.218
VII. 234	III.177
VII. 237	III.177
VII. 239	III.177
VIII. 1	I.138; XII.42
VIII. 3	XXIV.19
VIII. 5	III.243
VIII. 6	III.261
VIII. 9	III.243
VIII. 9-11	III.238, 254, 258
VIII. 12-3	I.116
VIII. 15-6	III.238, 254, 258
VIII. 19-22	I.160
VIII. 40-1	I.154
VIII. 48	I.138
VIII. 61	I.138; III.298
VIII. 62	III.303
VIII. 65	I.168; III.177.320
VIII. 73	I.358
VIII. 76	I.164
VIII. 79-80	III.253
VIII. 85	I.160
VIII. 95	I.165
VIII. 100	I.170
VIII. 123	III.338
VIII. 124	III.342
VIII. 136	I.172; III.331
VIII. 140-3	I.174
VIII. 141	I.167
VIII. 142	I.178
VIII. 144	I.178
IX. 4-5	III.332
IX. 15	XIII.15

IX. 20-4
IX. 27
IX. 41-88
IX. 70
IX. 71
IX. 81
IX. 96-101

Hippocrates
Περὶ Διαίτης II 57.10

Plutarch

Vit. Dec. Orat. 836 D
Vit. Dec. Orat. 847 A
Ages. 26
Ages. 28
Alc. 17
Alc. 22
Alc. 33
Alex. 13
Alex. 16
Arist. 5
Arist. 7
Arist. 8
Arist. 14
Arist. 16
Arist. 19
Arist. 20
Arist. 24-5
Cat. 5
Cim. 6
Cim. 8
Cim. 12-3
Cim. 13
Cim. 17
consol. ad Apoll. 102B
de Herod. malign.
de Herod. malign. 869F
Dio 5
Per. 3
Per. 5
Per. 8
Per. 16
Per. 20
Per. 33
Per. 34
Per. 39
Phoc. 14
Phoc. 17
Sol. 8
Sol. 21
Sol. 32
Them. 3
Them. 4
Them. 6
Them. 7
Them. 9
Them. 10
Them. 11
Them. 12
Them. 14
Them. 15
Them. 16
Them. 17
Them. 19
Them. 20
Them. 21
Them. 22
Them. 23
Them. 24
Them. 29
Them. 31
Thes. 27
Thes. 32

Theopompus

Tricarano (Jacoby
FGH II A)

Thucydides

I. 1
I. 4
I. 6
I. 9
I. 10
I. 13

I.183
I.52, 80, 83
I.182
I.183
III.328
I.190
I.198

LI.49

XXVIII.84
XXVIII.79
I.296
XI.18
III.32
VI.52
VI.52
I.331
I.331
I.105
III.413
III.232
I.183
I.182
I.183
I.190
I.282
III.462
III.142
III.409
I.202, 203
I.208, 209
III.146
II.412
XXXVI.57
III.251
III.379
III.97, 365
III.13, 34
I.63; III.71
III.118
III.32
III.69, 87
III.423
III.43
I.319
I.331
III.549; XV.35
III.646
III.189
III.237, 316
III.236, 288
I.97, 369; III.229, 232, 334, 344
III.239, 243
III.244, 245, 246
I.154; III.247, 251
III.232, 253, 344
III.253, 254
III.316, 317
III.320
I.122
III.209, 338
I.191
I.320; III.344
III.612
III.413
III.418
III.303, 383
III.348
III.345
I.83
III.408

XXVI.51

I. 15
I. 18
I. 48-55
I. 61-5
I. 70
I. 74
I. 76
I. 89
I. 89-93
I. 93
I. 94
I. 95
I. 98
I. 100
I. 100-1
I. 100-2
I. 102
I. 103
I. 104
I. 105
I. 105-6
I. 107
I. 107-8
I. 108
I. 109
I. 110
I. 111
I. 112
I. 113
I. 114
I. 115
I. 115-7
I. 116
I. 128
I. 128-34
I. 129
I. 132
I. 135
I. 136
I. 138
I. 139
I. 140
I. 140-5
I. 142
I. 143
I. 144
II. 12
II. 12
II. 13
II. 15
II. 17
II. 21
II. 22
II. 23
II. 24
II. 27
II. 34
II. 35
II. 37
II. 39
II. 40
II. 41
II. 45
II. 46
II. 49-52
II. 56
II. 59ff.
II. 60-4
II. 60
II. 61
II. 62
II. 65

II. 70
II. 71
II. 83-92
II. 84
II. 93
III. 2-50
III. 55
III. 68
III. 82
III. 86
III. 105-14
IV. 3-23
IV. 17
IV. 21

XXVIII.9
I.236
I.229
I.229
VII.19; XII.60
I.138
I.306
I.198
I.191, 351; III.418
III.304
I.198
I.200; III.278
I.198, 212
I.202, 203
I.212
I.222
I.212, 347
I.212, 214
I.204
I.212, 214; III.92; XII.46
I.214
I.351; XII.31, 40
I.219
I.212, 218, 221; XII.46
I.204
I.204
II.218; III.75; VI.41
I.212; VI.54
VI.41
I.224; III.74
I.225; III.120
I.224
III.74
VII.23
VII.18
XXVIII.139
I.190; III.199
III.418
III.383
III.345
VII.17; XII.7
III.377
III.121
II.434
III.92; VI.30
VI.30
III.84, 200
XXIII.48
I.233, 351; III.14, 32
II.109
I.55
III.23
III.69
III.75
I.233
VIII.10
I.368; III.196
III.71
I.392
I.260
XII.60
I.323
XXXI.19
I.368
III.427
III.75, 94; VII.16; VIII.14
III.85
XXVIII.71
III.14
III.121
XXVIII.74
II.340; III.21, 22, 32, 38,
39, 80, 421, 507; VI.30
I.229
I.190
I.229
III.317
VI.26
I.310
I.57
VIII.12
XXIII.48
I.232; V.7
I.229,
I.228, 229; III.121
I.279
I.225; III.120

IV. 26-41
 IV. 28
 IV. 36
 IV. 38
 IV. 42-5
 IV. 48
 IV. 53-4
 IV. 55
 IV. 65
 V. 10
 V. 11
 V. 11
 V. 17
 V. 32
 V. 66
 V. 117
 VI. 1
 VI. 6-19
 VI. 8-26
 VI. 16
 VI. 24
 VI. 32
 VI. 33
 VI. 34
 VI. 77
 VI. 90
 VI. 101
 VI. 104
 VII. 2
 VII. 11
 VII. 11-5
 VII. 13
 VII. 15
 VII. 19
 VII. 20
 VII. 44
 VII. 47
 VII. 86
 VIII. 1
 VIII. 2
 VIII. 15
 VIII. 17-8
 VIII. 26
 VIII. 37
 VIII. 58
 VIII. 62
 VIII. 63ff.
 VIII. 68
 VIII. 104

Xenophon

An. I.4.10
 An. I.7.1ff.
 Cyn. 5.34
 Cyr. 1.3
 Cyr. 7.1
 HG I. 1.11-26
 HG I. 6.23-34
 HG I. 7.34
 HG II. 1.15-32
 HG II. 2.9
 HG II. 2.19-20
 HG II. 2.23
 HG II. 4.28-39
 HG II. 4.30
 HG II. 4.39-43
 HG II. 4.43
 HG III. 5.3-25
 HG III. 5.5
 HG III. 5.8
 HG III. 5.16
 HG IV. 2.1ff.
 HG IV. 3.10-12
 HG IV. 4.15-17
 HG IV. 5.7-19
 HG IV. 8.9-12
 HG IV. 8.18
 HG IV. 8.25-9
 HG IV. 8.32-9
 HG V. 1.31-4
 HG V. 2.25-36
 HG V. 4.9
 HG V. 4.47-55
 HG V. 4.61-6
 HG VI. 2.14-38
 HG VI. 2.33-6
 HG VI. 3

I.229
 III.486; VII.20
 XL.17
 I.240; VII.16
 I.229
 III.683
 I.229
 I.240
 V.42
 III.486
 III.486
 XXXII.23
 XI.6
 I.302
 XXVI.88
 I.302
 XXVII.12
 I.232
 V.8
 XXVIII.73
 V.47
 V.33
 VI.51, 55
 XXVIII.74
 XXVIII.74
 V.21; VIII.14
 VI.40
 V.16
 VI.40
 VI.34, 40
 VI.14
 V.8
 V.49
 I.233
 I.233
 III.174
 VI.54
 III.507
 I.234
 I.235
 I.233
 I.235
 I.235
 I.235
 I.235
 I.235
 I.236
 I.236
 III.56
 I.236

XXXII.25; XLIV.16
 II.301
 XXXII.25; XLIV.16
 XXX.21
 XXVIII.105
 I.237
 I.241
 fr.III
 I.252
 VIII.10
 III.656; X.31; XI.7
 I.278
 I.26
 IX.30
 I.255
 XIII.12
 I.266
 IX.30
 X.32; XII.26
 XI.44
 I.269
 I.243
 I.291
 I.290
 I.280
 III.202
 I.292
 I.292
 I.271
 I.293
 I.293
 I.296
 I.297
 I.297
 I.313
 I.59, 374

HG VI. 4.3
 HG VI. 4.4-20
 HG VI. 4.15
 HG VI. 4.19-20
 HG VI. 5.23
 HG VI. 5.33-49
 HG VI. 5.45
 HG VI. 5.47
 HG VII. 1.14
 HG VII. 1.38
 HG VII. 4.1
 HG VII. 5.15-17
 Mem. I.2.12
 Mem. I.2.17
 Mem. I.2.31
 Vect. I.6

XII.7
 I.298
 XI.18
 XI.5
 XIII.18
 I.300
 XI.5
 XI.35
 I.301
 I.122
 I.319
 I.312
 III.434
 III.109
 III.438
 I.16

10. ORATORS

Aeschines

Or. I.25
 Or. II.164
 Or. III.15
 Or. III.107-12
 Or. III.206
 Or. XVIII.222

XXVIII.141
 I.319
 I.319
 I.363
 I.183
 XXVIII.76

Demosthenes

Against Leptines (title)

I. 1
 I. 5
 I. 8
 II. 12
 II. 17
 III. 3
 III. 15
 III. 20
 III. 21
 III. 24
 III. 25
 III. 31
 III. 32
 IV. 17
 VI. 8
 VI. 20
 VIII. 22
 VIII. 23
 VIII. 44-5
 VIII. 74
 IX. 17
 IX. 25
 IX. 26
 IX. 42
 IX. 42-3
 IX. 66
 X. 71
 X. 76
 XIII. 34
 XV. 16
 XV. 29
 XVI. 14
 XVIII. 7
 XVIII. 21
 XVIII. 44
 XVIII. 68
 XVIII. 79
 XVIII. 80
 XVIII. 87
 XVIII. 89
 XVIII. 93
 XVIII. 98
 XVIII. 99
 XVIII. 129
 XVIII. 170
 XVIII. 194
 XVIII. 204
 XVIII. 208
 XVIII. 213
 XVIII. 221
 XVIII. 222
 XVIII. 237
 XVIII. 238
 XVIII. 260

IV.3
 II.72
 IX.14
 I.319
 X.27
 XXXVI.10
 II.186
 XII.60
 I.372
 III.506
 I.233
 I.302
 fr.95
 XXVIII.150
 I.319
 I.302
 IX.7,17
 II.1
 XLVII.16
 X.5
 I.319
 IX.17
 I.283
 I.59,319; IX.17; X.15
 III.334
 I.369
 X.7
 II.280
 XXXIII.34
 III.97, 184, 300
 VII.2
 I.271
 I.319
 IV.20
 IV.27
 IV.16
 III.34
 I.319
 I.319
 I.319
 I.298
 I.319
 I.7
 XLVII.16
 XII.38
 I.158
 III.556
 X.6
 XXVIII.75
 XXVIII.76
 III.504
 I.138
 III.665

XVIII. 287
 XVIII. 302
 XVIII. 304-5
 XVIII. 306
 XVIII. 314
 XVIII. 315
 XVIII. 316
 XVIII. 317
 XIX. 87
 XIX. 141
 XIX. 251
 XIX. 252
 XIX. 265
 XIX. 266
 XIX. 271
 XIX. 272
 XIX. 273
 XIX. 277
 XIX. 280
 XIX. 303
 XIX. 313
 XX. 11
 XX. 11-12
 XX. 13-14
 XX. 52ff.
 XX. 54
 XX. 59
 XX. 59ff.
 XX. 60
 XX. 68
 XX. 79
 XX. 104
 XX. 167
 XXI. 17
 XXI. 161
 XXI. 174
 XXII. 14
 XXIII. 3-6
 XXIII. 50
 XXIII. 66
 XXIII. 74
 XXIII. 140
 XXIV. 152
 XLV. 80
 LX. 5
 LXI. 40-4, 50
 Epist. III.25
 Epist. III.45
 Prooemium 39.1

Dinarchus

Against Dem. 37

Isocrates

I. 6
 III. 5
 IV. 14
 IV. 15
 IV. 18
 IV. 48
 IV. 54-8
 IV. 68-70
 IV. 72
 IV. 86
 IV. 100-2
 IV. 106
 IV. 107
 IV. 109
 IV. 115-121
 IV. 175-80
 IV. 179
 IV. 188
 V. 63-4
 VII. 68
 VII. 75
 VII. 80
 VIII. 39
 VIII. 76
 XII. 41ff.
 XII. 43
 XII. 56
 XII. 58
 XII. 59
 XII. 62-4
 XII. 70
 XII. 193

XVI.31
 I.319
 XXVIII.77
 III.76
 III.500
 XXXI.19
 III.505
 III.502
 IX.34
 IX.10
 XXVIII.141
 XV.35
 X.7
 I.319
 I.369; III.334
 III.336
 I.208, 209
 I.293
 I.293
 III.160
 III.693
 I.302
 I.259
 I.302
 I.59
 I.294
 I.294
 I.59
 I.294
 I.280
 III.270
 III.646
 XXXIV.62
 I.78
 I.319
 I.319
 I.319
 I.331
 XXVIII.50
 I.48
 I.48
 XI.19
 II.255
 III.664
 I.37
 III.678
 II.253
 XXIII.71
 V.14

I.293

II.408
 I.330
 XXVIII.95
 XXIII.2
 XIV.8
 I.330
 I.80
 I.83, 85
 I.136, 149
 III.199
 I.302
 I.283
 I.138
 I.302
 I.271
 I.271
 I.117
 XXVIII.95
 I.283
 I.259
 I.149
 I.208-9
 II.412
 I.149
 I.238
 I.63
 I.283
 I.250
 I.271
 I.302
 I.80
 I.83, 85

XII. 197
 XII. 271
 XIII. 1ff.
 XV. 109
 XV. 253

I.302
 I.185
 III.677
 I.297
 I.330

Hyperides

Deliacus fr. 67 J-K

I.13

Lysias

II. 55
 XVI. 18
 XXIV. 18
 author of *Apollogia of Iphicrates*
fr. 39 S
fr. 40 S
fr. 41 S
fr. 42 S
fr. 128 S
fr. 281 B-S
fr. 296 B-S

I.283
 III.244
 III.138
 XXVIII.84
 XXVIII.85
 XXVIII.85
 XXVIII.85
 XXVIII.85
 XXVIII.86
 III.677
 III.607

Ancient Commentaries

schol. Od. 4.356
schol. Ar. Nub. 144

XXXVI.107
 XXII.8

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ABBOTT, F., and JOHNSON, A. (1926): *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, (Princeton).
- AÉLION, R. (1983): *Euripide héritier d' Aischyle*, vol.I, (Paris).
- ALDERISIO, F. (1960): "Il *Nómos* di Pindaro nel *Gorghias* e nei *Nómoi* di Platone", *RSF* 13: 22-46.
- ALEXIOU, M. (1974): *The ritual lament in Greek tradition*, (Cambridge).
- ALPERS, K. (1998): "Lexicographica Minora", in C.F. COLLATZ and J. DUMMER and J. KOLLESCH and M.L. WERLITZ (1998) (eds.): *Dissertationum criticae: Festschrift für Günther Christian Hansen*, (Würzburg), 93-108.
- AMANN, J. (1931): *Die Zeusrede des Ailius Aristides*, (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 12) (Stuttgart).
- ANDERSON, G. (1990): "The Second Sophistic: Some Problems of Perspective", in RUSSELL 1990b: 91-110.
- (1993): *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*, (London, New York).
- ARRIGHETTI, G. (1987): "I miti di Coronide e Asclepio nella Pitica III di Pindaro", in *Poeti, eruditi e Biografi*, (Pisa), 125-34.
- AVENARIUS, G. (1956): *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*, (Meisenheim).
- BARKHUIZEN, J.H. (1970): "A Note on Pindar *Pyth.*III.8-60", *A.Class* 13: 137-9.
- BARNS, J. (1950): "A New Gnomologium: with Some Remarks on Gnostic Anthologies (I)", *C.Q.* 44: 126-37.
- BARRETT, W.S. (1992): *Euripides Hippolytus: Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, (Oxford).
- BAXTER, T.M.S. (1992): *The Cratylus: Plato's Critique of Naming*, (Leiden-New York-Köln).
- BECKER, O. (1937): *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken*, (Hermes Einzelschriften 4) (Berlin).
- (1940): "Pindars Olympische Ode vom Glück", *Die Antike*, 16: 38-50.
- BEECKE, E. (1908): *Die historischen Angaben in Aelius Aristides Panathenaikos auf ihre Quellen untersucht*, (Strassburg).
- BEHR, C.A. (1968a): *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*, (Amsterdam).
- (1968): "Citations of Porphyry's *Against Aristides* Preserved in Olympiodorus", *AJP* 89: 186-99.
- (1969): "'Aelius Aristides' Birth Date corrected to November 26, 117 AD", *AJP* 90: 75-7.

- (1973) (ed., trans.): *Aristides*, vol.I (only): *Panathenaic Oration and In Defence of Oratory*, (Loeb: Cambridge, Massachusetts).
- (1981) (trans.): *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works*, vol.II: *Orations XVII-LIII* (Leiden).
- (1986) (trans.): *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works*, vol.I: *Orations I-XVI*, (with an Appendix containing the fragments and Inscriptions) (Leiden).
- (1994): “Studies on the Biography of Aelius Aristides”, *ANRW* ii. 34.2: 1140-1233.
- BELL, R.E.** (1991): *Women of Classical Mythology: a biographical dictionary*, (New York, Oxford).
- BENVENISTE, E.** (1974): *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*, vols.I-II, Paris 1969, Engl. trans.: *Indo-European Language and Society*, (London 1973).
- BERNABÉ, A.** (1996) (ed.) *Poetarum Epicorum Graecorum, Testimonia et Fragmenta*, Pars I, (Lipsiae).
- BERNAND, A.** (1972): *De Koptos à Kosseir*, (Leiden).
- BERNARDINI ANGELI, P.** (1980): “Esaltazione e critica dell' atletismo nella poesia dal VII al V sec. a.C.: Storia di un' ideologia”, *Stadion* 6: 81-111.
- BIELER, L.** (1970): “ΣΚΙΑΣ ΟΝΑΡ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ”, *WS* 51 (1933):143-5; (repr. in W.M. Calder III -J. Stern (eds.), *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, [Darmstadt]), 191-3.
- BIESE, A.** (1882): *Die Entwicklung des Naturgefühls bei den Griechen*, (Kiel).
- BLANK, D.L.** (1998) (trans., intr., comm.): *Sextus Empiricus Against the Grammarians (Abversus Mathematicos I)*, (Oxford).
- BÖMER, F.** (1953): “Der Commentarius”, *Hermes*, 81: 210-250.
- BOMPAIRE, J.** (1958): *Lucien Écrivain, Imitation et Création*, BEFAR 190 (Paris).
- BONA, G.** (1988): *Pindaro i Peani: Testo, Traduzione, scoli e commento*, CNR.
- BORNEMANN, L.** (1892): “Jahresbericht über Pindar 1891”, *JAW* 71: 268-91.
- BORNEMANN, F.** (1978): “Zur Geryoneis des Stesichoros und Pindars Herakles-Dithyrambos”, *ZPE* 31: 33-5.
- BOULANGER, A.** (1923): *Aelius Aristide et la Sophistique dans la Province d' Asie au II^e siècle de notre ère*, BEFAR 126 (Paris).
- BOWERSOCK, G.W.** (1969): *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*, (Oxford).
- BOWIE, E.L.** (1974): “The Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic”, in M.I. FINLEY (1974) (ed.): *Studies in Ancient Society*, (London and Boston), 166-209 (repr. with some changes from *P&P* 46 [1970], 3-41).
- (1982): “The Importance of Sophists”, *YCS* 27: 29-60.
- (1989): “Greek Sophists and Greek Poetry in the Second Sophistic”, *ANRW* ii. 33.1: 209-58.
- (1990): “Greek Poetry in the Antonine Age”, in RUSSELL 1990b: 53-90.

- BOWRA, C.M.** (1961): *Greek Lyric Poetry: From Alcman to Simonides*, (2Oxford).
 ——— (1953): *Problems in Greek Poetry*, (Oxford).
 ——— (1955): *Inspiration and Poetry*, (London).
 ——— (1964): *Pindar*, (Oxford).
 ——— (1969): *The Odes of Pindar*, (Harmondsworth).
 ——— (1970): *On Greek Margins*, (Oxford).
- BRANDWOOD, L.** (1976): *A word index to Plato*, (Leeds).
- BRASWELL, B.K.** (1988): *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*, (Berlin, New York).
- BRINKMANN, A.** (1910): "Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht", *RhM* 65: 149-155.
- BROMMER, F.** (1937): "Die Rückführung des Hephaistos", *JdI* 52: 198-219.
- BROWN, C.** (1984): "The Bridegroom and the Athlete: The Proem to Pindar's Seventh Olympian", in D.E. GERBER (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of L. Woodbury*, (Chico), 37-50.
- BROWN, E.L.** (1977): "The Divine Name 'Pan'", *TAPhA* 107: 57-61.
- BUCHWALD, W.** (1939): *Studien zur Chronologie der attischen Tragödie*, (Diss. Königsberg).
- BUCK, C.D.** (1954): *The Greek Dialects*, (Chicago).
- BUNDY, E.L.** (1986): *Studia Pindarica*, (repr. in one volume · originally published in 1962) (Berkeley, Los Angeles).
- BUNSON, M.** (1994): *Encyclopedia of the Roman Empire*, (New York).
- BURGER, R.** (1980): *Plato's Phaedrus: a Defence of a Philosophic Art of Writing*, (Alabama).
- BURNET, J.** (1902): "A Neglected MS. of Plato", *CR* 16: 98-101.
 ——— (1903): "Vindobonensis F and the text of Plato", *CR* 17: 12-4.
- BURNETT, A.P.** (1985): *The Art of Bacchylides*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts).
- BURTON, G.B.** (1992): "The Addressees of Aelius Aristides, *Orations* 17 K and 21 K", *C.Q.* ii.42: 444-7.
- BURTON, R.** (1962): *Pindar's Pythian Odes: Essays in Interpretation*, (Oxford).
- BURY, J.B.- MEIGGS, R.** (1989): *A History of Greece to the death of Alexander the Great*, (4London).
- CAIRNS, F.** (1977): "Ἐπεὶ in Pindar's First Olympian ode", *Hermes*, 105: 129-37.
- CALDERINI, A.** (1921): "Commenti Minori al Testo di Omero in Documenti Egiziani", *Aegyptus*, II: 303-26.
- CALDWELL, R.** (1989): *The Origin of the Gods: a psychoanalytic study of Greek theogonic myth*, (New York , Oxford).
- CALVO, T.** (1992): "Socrates' First Speech in the *Phaedrus* and Plato's' Criticism of Rhetoric", in L. ROSSETTI (ed.), *Understanding the Phaedrus*, Proceedings of the II Symposium Platonicum, (Sankt Augustin: Academia-Verlag), 47-60.

- CANNATÀ-FERA, M. (1990) (ed., trans., comm.): *Pindaro Trenodie: Introduzione, Testo Critico, Traduzione e Commento*, (Roma).
- CAREY, C. (1981): *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar: Pythian 2, Pythian 9, Nemean 1, Nemean 7, Isthmian 8*, (Salem, New Hampshire).
- CARLINI, A. (1971): *Nuovi Papiri Letterari Fiorentini*, Presentati al "XIII. Intern. Papyrologenkongress" Marburg / Lahn, 2-6 Agosto 1971, (Scuola Normale Superiore) (Pisa).
- CARRIÈRE, J. (1962): "Lueurs nouvelles sur la Seconde Olympique de Pindare", *Pallas*, 11: 29-45.
- CASTAGNA, L. (1971): "Pindaro, fr.169 Sn.³: interpretazione e proposta di datazione", *SIFC* 43: 173-198.
- (1989): "Pindaro in Plutarco", in *Strutture formali dei "Moralia" di Plutarco*, Atti del Convegno plutarco (Palermo, 3-5 maggio 1989), 163-85.
- CAVALLO, G. and MAEHLER, H. (1987): *Greek Bookhands of the early Byzantine Period AD 300-800*, (ICS Bulletin Supplement 47) (London).
- CHAMOUX, F. (1953): *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades*, (Paris).
- CHANTRAINE, P. (1968): *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, (Paris).
- COOK, A.B. (1900): "Iostéphanos", *JHS* 20: 1-13.
- CROISET, A. (1921): "Le fragment de Pindare cité dans le Gorgias de Platon", *REG* 34: 125-8.
- CROTTY, K. (1982): *Song and Action: The Victory Odes of Pindar*, (Baltimore, London).
- CROWTHER, N.B. (1979): "Water and Wine as Symbols of Inspiration", *Mnemosyne*, 32: 1-11.
- DAY, J.W. (1980): *The Glory of Athens. The Popular Tradition as Reflected in the Panathenaicus of Aelius Aristides*, (Chicago).
- de MARTINO, F. (1982): *Omero agonista in Delo*, (Antichità Classica e Cristiana, 22) (Brescia).
- DEGANI, E. *Civiltà dei greci* 2, Antologia per il liceo classico, (Pindaro: Olimpica I), 255-68.
- DEGANI, E., and BURZACCHINI, G. (1977): *Lirici greci: Antologia*, (Firenze).
- DEICHGRÄBER, K. (1933): "Hymnische Elemente in der philosophischen Prosa der Vorsokratiker", *Philologus*, 88 (N.F. Bd. 42): 347-361.
- DEININGER, J. (1965): *Die Provinziallandtage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, (Munich).
- DELLING, G. (1970): *ΜΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ*, in *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum*, (Göttingen).
- DEMOS, M. (1991): *Lyric Quotation in Plato*, (Diss. Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts).
- DENNISTON, J.D. (1954): *The Greek Particles*, (rev. by K.J. Dover) (2Oxford).

- de VRIES, G.J.** (1969): *A Commentary on the Phaedrus of Plato*, (Amsterdam).
- des PLACES, E.S.J.** (1949): *Pindare et Platon*, (Paris).
- DEVREESSE, R.** (1954): *Introduction à l' étude des manuscrits grecs*, (Paris).
- DICKIE, M.W.** (1976): "On the Meaning of ἐφήμερος", *ICS* 1: 7-14.
- DIELS, H., and KRANZ, W.,** (1952): *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, Griechisch und Deutsch⁵, vols.I-II, (Berlin).
- DIHLE, A.** (1994): *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire From Augustus to Justinian*, (trans. M.Malzahn) (London, New York).
- DILLON, J.** (1996): *The Middle Platonists: A study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*, (revised edition with new afterword, originally published in 1977) (Bristol).
- DINDORF, W.** (1964) (ed.): *Aristides*, vols.I-III, (repr. of 1829 ed.) (Leipzig).
- DISSEN, L.** (1830): *Pindari carmina quae supersunt cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis... commentario perpetuo illustravit*, vols.I-II, (Gotha).
- DODDS, E.R.** (1951): *The Greeks and the irrational*, (Berkeley).
- (1965): *Pagan and Christian in the Age of Anxiety*, (Cambridge).
- (1990): *Plato Gorgias, A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary*, (Oxford).
- DORNSEIFF, F.** (1933): *Die archaische Mythen-erzählung*, (Berlin).
- DOVER, K.J.** (1974): *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, (Berkeley).
- (1978): *Greek Homosexuality*, (London).
- (1988): "Greek homosexuality and initiation", in *Collected Papers, The Greeks and their legacy*, vol.II, 115-34, (Oxford).
- DRACHMANN, A.B.** (1903-10-27) (ed.): *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina*, vols.I-III, (Teubner, Leipzig).
- DUCHEMIN, J.** (1955): *Pindare, poète et prophète*, (Paris).
- EASTERLING, P.E.** (1989) (ed., comm.): *Sophocles Trachiniae*, (Cambridge).
- and **KNOX, B.M.W.** (1985) (eds.): *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol.I. *Greek Literature*, (Cambridge).
- EDELSTEIN, E., and EDELSTEIN, L.** (1945): *Asclepius: A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies*, vols.I-II, (Baltimore).
- EHRENBERG, V.** (1921): *Die Rechtsidee im frühen Griechentum*, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der werdenden Polis, (Leipzig).
- EK, S.** (1942): *Herodotismen in der Archäologie des Dionys von Halikarnass. Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung des beginnenden Klassizismus*, (Lund).
- ERBSE, H.E.** (1949-[1950]): "Untersuchungen zu den Attizistischen Lexica", *ADAW, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, Jg. 1949, nr.2.

- FARNELL, L.R.** (1930): *The works of Pindar: Translated with Literary and Critical Commentaries*, vol.I, Translation in Rhythmical prose with Literary Comments, (London).
- (1932): vols.I-II, *The Text* (London).
- (1961): vols.I-III, *Critical Commentary* (Amsterdam), repr. of vols.I-II *Critical Commentary* (London, 1932).
- FASCHER, E.** (1927): *Προφήτης: Eine sprach-und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, (Giessen).
- FEHR, K.** (1936): *Die Mythen bei Pindar*, (Diss. Zürich).
- FESTUGIÈRE, A.-J.** (1969): "Sur les *Discours sacrés* d' Aelius Aristide", *REG* 82: 117-53 (=id, *Études d' histoire et de philologie*, [Paris 1975], 89-125).
- FLIERLE, J.** (1890): *Über Nachahmungen des Demosthenes, Thukydides und Xenophon in den Reden der Römischen Archäologie des Dionysios von Halikarnass*, (Leipzig).
- FOGELMARK, S.** (1972): *Studies in Pindar with particular reference to Paeon VI and Nemean VII*, (Lund).
- FONTENROSE, J.** (1978): *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations with a Catalogue of Responses*, (Berkeley).
- FRACCAROLI, G.** (1894): *Le Ode di Pindaro*, (Verona).
- FRÄNKEL, H.** (1968): *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens*, (Munich).
- (1968): "Ἐφήμερος als Kennwort für die menschliche Natur", in: *Wege und Formen*, 23-39. (First publication in English *TAPhA* 77(1946), 131-45).
- (1973): *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy: A History of Greek Epic, Lyric, and Prose to the Middle of the Fifth Century*, (trans. M.Hadas and J.Willis) (Oxford).
- FRAZER, J.G.** (1970 = 1921): *Apollodorus, The library*, vols.2. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London (Loeb).
- FREDE, D.** (1986): "The Impossibility of Perfection: Socrates' Criticism of Simonides' Poem in the *Protagoras*", *RMeta* 39: 729-53.
- FREUDENTHAL, J.** (1880): "Zu Phavorinus und der mittelalterlichen Florilegienlitteratur", *RhM* 35: 408-30.
- FRIEDLÄNDER, P.** (1964): *Plato*, (trans. H. Meyerhoff vols. I-III) (Princeton).
- FRISK, H.** (1932): *Studien zur Wortstellung im Griechischen*, (Göteborg).
- GALINSKY, G.K.** (1972): *The Heracles Theme: the Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*, (Oxford).
- GALLO, I.** (1968): *Una Nuova Biografia di Pindaro* (POxy. 2438), (Salerno).
- (1977): "Eustazio commentatore di Pindaro", *QUCC* 25: 43-51.
- (1986): *Greek and Latin Papyrology*, (trans. M.R. Falivene and J.R. March), (Classical Handbook 1) (London).

- GANTZ, T.** (1993): *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, (Baltimore, London).
- GAUTHIER, H.** (1931a): *Les fêtes du dieu Min*, (Le Caire).
 ——— (1931b): *Le personnel du dieu Min*, (Le Caire).
- GELZER, T.** (1978): “Klassizismus, Attizismus und Asianismus”, in *Le classicisme à Rome aux I^{ers} siècles avant et après J. - C.*, (Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XXV), 1-55.
- GENNARO, S.** (1951): “Il Croiset e il frammento di Pindaro nel *Gorgia*”, *Sic Gymn* 4: 103-8.
- GENTILI, B.** (1958): *Bacchilide. Studi*, (Urbino).
 ——— (1988): *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece From Homer to the Fifth Century*, (trans. with an introduction, by A.T. Cole) (Baltimore, London).
 ——— (1995): *Pindaro, Le Pitiche, Introduzione*, testo critico e traduzione di B.Gentili, Commento a cura di A. Bernardini, E. Cingano, B.Gentili e P. Giannini, (Fondazione Lorenzo Valla) (Milano).
- GERBER, D.E.** (1982): *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary*, (Toronto).
- GERHARDT, H.G.** (1959): *Zeus in den pindarischen Epinikien*, (Diss. Frankfurt/M).
- GIANNINI, P.** (1982): “‘Qualcuno’ e ‘nessuno’ in Pind. *Pyth.* 8, 95”, *QUCC* n.s.11: 69-76.
- GIANOTTI, G.F.** (1975): *Per una poetica Pindarica*, (Turin).
 ——— (1975a): “Il terzo Carme Nemeo di Pindaro”, *Atti dell' Accademia delle Scienze di Torino: classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, 109: 29-65
- GIGANTE, M.** (1956): *Νόμος βασιλεύς*: Ricerche filol. I (Naples).
 ——— (1966): “Nuovi resti dell' ode pindarica νόμος πάντων βασιλεύς”, in *Atti dell' XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Milano), 286-311.
 ——— (1968): “Euripide e il nuovo frammento pindarico (169 Snell³)” *PP* 23: 48-50.
- GILDERSLEEVE, B.L.** (1888): “On the Stylistic Effect of the Greek Participle”, *AJP* 9: 137-157.
 ——— (1908) (ed., comm.): *Pindar, the Olympian and Pythian Odes, with an Introductory Essay, Notes, and Indexes*, (London) (repr. Amsterdam 1965).
- GLÖCKNER, S.** (1910): “Aus Sopatros Μεταποιήσεις”, *RhM* 65: 504-14.
- GRANT, M., and HAZEL, J.** (1979): *Who's who in Classical Mythology*, (London).
- GRAUX, C.** (1881): “Une Olympique de Pindare écrite à l' encre d' or”, *RPh* 5: 117-21. (= Notices bibliographiques et autres articles [Paris 1884] 302-7).
- GREENE, W.** (1944): *Moirai*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts).
- GRENFELL, B.P., and HUNT, A.S.** (1908) (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part V, (London).
- GRIFFIN, M.** (1971): review of BOWERSOCK 1969, in *JRS* 61: 279-81.
- GRONINGEN, B.A. VAN** (1955): “Ad Pindari Dithyrambi Fragmentum 75 S”, *Mnemosyne*, 8: 192.

- GRUBE, G.M.A. (1965): *The Greek and the Roman Critics*, (London).
- GUTHRIE, W.K.C. (1969): *The Sophists* [*History of Greek Philosophy*, vol.III, part I], (Cambridge).
- HAAS, A. (1884): *Quibus fontibus Aelius Aristides in componenda declamatione, quae inscribitur πρὸς Πλάτωνα ὑπὲρ τῶν τεττάρων, usus sit*, (Diss. Greifswald).
- HAEDICKE, W. (1936): *Die Gedanken der Griechen über Familienherkunft und Vererbung*, (Diss. Halle).
- HAINSWORTH, B. (1993): *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume III: books 9-12*, (Cambridge).
- HALDANE, J.A. (1968): "Pindar and Pan: frs.95-100 Snell", *Phoenix*, 22: 18-31.
- HALFMANN, H. (1979): *Die Senatoren aus dem östlichen Teil des Imperium Romanum bis zum Ende des 2. Jh. n. Chr.*, (Göttingen).
- HARRIOT, R. (1969): *Poetry and Criticism before Plato*, (London).
- HARTUNG, J.A. (1855-57): *Pindar's Werke, Griechisch mit metrischer Übersetzung und prüfenden und erklärenden Anmerkungen*, vols. I-IV, (Leipzig).
- HAURY, J. (1888): *Quibus fontibus Aristides usus sit in declamatione quae inscribitur Παναθηναϊκός*, (Diss. Augsburg).
- HEINIMANN, F. (1945): *Nomos und Physis*, (Basel).
- HEITSCH, E. (1964): *Die griechischen Dichterfragmente der römischen Kaiserzeit*, vols.I-II, (Göttingen).
- HERBIG, R. (1949): *Pan der griechische Bocksgott*, (Frankfurt/M).
- HEWITT, J.W. (1927): "The Terminology of 'Gratitude' in Greek", *CP* 22: 142-61.
- HIGNETT, C. (1962): *Xerxes' Invasion of Greece*, (Oxford).
- HOEKSTRA, A. (1961): "The Absence of the Aeginetans", *Mnemosyne*, S. iv 15: 1-14.
- HÖFLER, A. (1935): *Der Sarapishymnus des Ailios Aristides*, (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 27) (Stuttgart - Berlin).
- HOFMANN, H. (1976): *Mythos und Komödie*, (Hildesheim).
- HOMBERT, M. and PRÉAUX, C. (1951): "Une Tablette Homérique de la Bibliothèque Bodléenne", *AIPhO* 11: 161-8.
- HORST, P.W. VAN DER (1980): *Aelius Aristides and the New Testament*, (Studia ad corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti, 6.) (Leiden).
- HOUSEHOLDER, F.W. (1941): *Literary Quotations and Allusion in Lucian*, (Diss. New York).
- HOOKE, J.T.W. (1957): "Pindar and the Athenian festivals of Dionysus", *PCA* 54: 35-6.
- (1987): "Homeric φίλος", *Glotta*, 65: 44-65.
- HOW, W.W., and WELLS, L. (1912): *A Commentary on Herodotus: With Introduction and Appendixes*, vols.I-II, (Oxford).

- HOWIE, J.G.** (1983): "The Revision of Myth in Pindar, Ol. 1", *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, 4: 277-313.
- HUBBARD, T.K.** (1985): *The Pindaric Mind: A study of logical structure in early Greek Poetry*, (Supplements to Mnemosyne no.85: Bibliotheca Classica Batava) (Leiden).
- HUG, A.** (1912): *Leben und Werke des Redners Aristoteles*, (Diss. Freiburg/S.).
- HÜTTL, W.** (1933-6): *Antoninus Pius*, vols.I-II, (Prague).
- IAKOV, D.** (1994) (ed., intr., comm.): Πινδάρου Πυθιονικοί, (trans. G. Oikonomides) Βικελαία Δημοτική Βιβλιοθήκη, 7 ~ Κείμενα Ἑλληνικά, (Herakleion).
- IBRACHIM, M.X.** (1972): Ἡ Ἑλληνορωμαϊκή παιδεία ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ Α' ἕως τοῦ Δ' μ.Χ. αἰῶνος κατὰ τοὺς παπύρους, (Diss. Athens).
- ILLIG, L.** (1932): *Zur Form der pindarischen Erzählung*, (Berlin).
- INSTONE, S.** (1996) (ed., trans.): *Pindar Selected Odes: Olympian One Pythian Nine, Nemean Two & Tree, Isthmian One*, (with illustrations by Holly Bennett), (London).
- IOANNIDOU, G.H.** (1995): *Catalogue of Greek and Latin literary papyri in Berlin*, (Mainz).
- IRIGOIN, J.** (1952): *Histoire du Texte de Pindare*, (Études et commentaires, 13) (Paris).
- IRWIN, E.** (1984): "The Crocus and the Rose: A Study of the Interrelationship between the Natural and the Divine World in Early Greek Poetry", in D.E. GERBER (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies in Honour of L. Woodbury*, (Chico), 147-68.
- JALLES, A.** (1913): "Horai", *RE* VIII.2 (1913), cols.2300-313.
- JANKO, R.** (1992): *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume IV: books 13-16*, (Cambridge).
- JEBB, R.C.** (1905) (ed., trans., comm.): *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments*, (Cambridge).
- JÖHRENS, G.** (1981) (ed., trans., comm.): *Der Athenahymnus des Aelius Aristides mit einem Anhang zum Höhenkult der Athena und Testimonien zur allegorischen Deutung der Athena*, (Teil 1: Lesetext, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Teil 2: Anhang, Testimonien, Indices) (Bonn).
- JOUAN, F.** (1966): *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens*, (Paris).
- JÜTHNER, J.** (1936): "Zu Pindar Pyth. 8.96", *WS* 54: 142-3.
- KAIMIO, M.** (1977): *Characterization of Sound in Early Greek Literature*, (Helsinki).
- KAMBYLIS, A.** (1964): "Anredeformen bei Pindar", in *Χάρις Κωνσταντίνω Ι. Βουρβέρη*, (Athens), 95-199.
- (1965): *Die Dichterweihe und ihre Symbolik*, (Heidelberg).
- KARADIMAS, D.** (1996): *Sextus Empiricus against Aelius Aristides: The Conflict between Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Second Century A.D.*, (Lund).
- KEIL, B.** (1898) (ed.): *Aelii Aristidis Smyrnaei: Quae supersunt omnia*, vol.II, *Orationes XVII-LIII*, (repr. 1958) (Berlin).
- (1913): "Pindarfragment", *Hermes*, 48: 319-20.
- KELLER, O.** (1909-1913): *Die Antike Tierwelt*, vols.I-II, (Leipzig).

- KELLS, J.H.** (1989) (ed., comm.): *Sophocles Electra*, (Cambridge).
- KENNEDY, G.A.** (1959): "The Earliest Rhetorical Handbooks", *AJP* 80: 169-178.
- (1972): *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.–A.D. 300*, (Princeton).
- (1983): *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*, (Princeton, New Jersey).
- (1991): *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*, Newly translated with Introduction, Notes, and Appendixes, (New York, Oxford).
- (1994): *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, (Princeton).
- (1997): "The Genres of Rhetoric", in PORTER 1997: 43-50.
- KENYON, F.G.** (1932): *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, (Oxford).
- KEYSSNER, K.** (1932): *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus*, (Stuttgart).
- KINDSTRAND, J.F.** (1973): *Homer in der Zweiten Sophistik. Studien zu der Homerlektüre und dem Homerbild bei Dion von Prusa, Maximus von Tyros und Ailius Aristides*, Uppsala 1973. (Acta Univ. Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia. 7).
- KIRK, G.S.** (1990): *The Iliad: A Commentary Volume II: books 5-8*, (Cambridge).
- KIRKWOOD, G.** (1982): *Selections from Pindar: Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*, (Amer. Phil. Ass. 7) (Chico, California).
- (1981): "Pindar's Ravens (*Olymp.* 2.87)", *C.Q.* n.s. 31: 240-3.
- KLEIN, R.** (1981): *Die Romrede des Aelius Aristides, Einführung*, (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft) (Darmstadt).
- (1983): *P. Aelii Aristidis Orationem Eis Ρώμην, Die Romrede des Aelius Aristides, herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Erläuterungen versehen*, (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft) (Darmstadt).
- KÖHLER, L.** (1928): *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker*, Herausgegeben, Übersetzt und Kommentiert (Philologus, Supplement band XX, Heft II) (Leipzig).
- KÖHNKEN, A.** (1971): *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar: Interpretationen zu sechs Pindargedichten*, (Berlin).
- (1974): "Pindar as innovator: Poseidon Hippios and the relevance of the Pelops story in Olympian I", *Classical Quarterly*, 24: 199-206.
- KOMORNICKA, A.M.** (1972): "Quelques remarques sur la notion d' alátheia et de pseûdos chez Pindare", *Eos*, 60: 235-53.
- KOPIDAKIS, M.Z.** (1987): *Τὸ Γ' Μακκαβαίων καὶ ὁ Αἰσχύλος: Αἰσχύλεια Μνημεῖα στὸ Λεκτικὸ καὶ στὴ Θεματογραφία τοῦ Γ' Μακκαβαίων*, (Diss. Herakleion).
- KRAUT, R.** (1992): (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to PLATO*, (Cambridge).
- KROLL, W.** (1924): *Studien zum Verständnis der Römischen Literatur*, (Stuttgart) (²1964).
- KURKE, L.** (1991): *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, (Ithaka and London).

- LANATA, G.** (1963): *Poetica Pre-Platonica: Testimoniazze e frammenti, Testo, Traduzione e Commento*, (Firenze).
- LANDFESTER, M.** (1966): *Das griechische Nomen "philos" und seine Ableitungen*, Spudasmata 11, (Hildesheim).
- LANG, P.** (1911): *De Speusippi Academ. scriptis*, (Diss. Bonn).
- LAUSBERG, H.** (1998): *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, (trans. M.T. Bliss, A. Jansen, D.E. Orton, with a foreword by G.A. Kennedy) (Leiden · Boston · Köln).
- LAWSON, J.C.** (1932): *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus, a revised text with introduction, verse translation, and critical notes*, (Cambridge).
- LE GLAY, M.** (1976): "Hadrien et l' Asklépieion de Pergame", *BCH* 100 (1976), pp.347-72.
- LEFKOWITZ, M.R.** (1963): "ΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ: The First Person in Pindar." *HSPH* 67: 177-253.
- (1981): *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, (London).
- LEHNUS, L.** (1979): *L' Inno a Pan di Pindaro*, (Milano).
- (1981): *Pindaro, Olimpiche*, (Milan).
- LEHRS, K.** (1873): *Die Pindarscholien, Eine kritische Untersuchung zur philologischen quellenkunde*, (Leipzig).
- LENZ, F.W.** (1934): *Untersuchungen zu den Aristeidesscholien*, Problemata VIII (Berlin, Weidmann).
- (1959) (ed.): *The Aristeides 'Prolegomena'*, (Supplements to Mnemosyne no.5: Bibliotheca Classica Batava) (Leiden·New York·Köln).
- (1961): "Der Dionysoshymnos des Aristeides", *RCCM* 3: 153-66.
- (1963): "Der Athenahymnos des Aristeides", *RCCM* 5: 329-47.
- (1964): *Aristeidessstudien*. (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, 40) (Berlin).
- LENZ†, F.W., and BEHR, C.A.** (1976-80) (eds.): *P. Aelii Aristidis, Opera Quae extant omnia*, vol.I, *Orationes I-XVI complectens*, Fasc.4, (Leiden).
- LESKY, A.** (1966): *A History of Greek Literature*, (trans. J. Willis and C. de Heer) (London).
- LEWIS, N.** (1936): "Greek Literary Papyri from the Strassbourg Collection", *Étud.Pap.* III: 46-7 and 87-90.
- (1974): *Papyrus in Classical Antiquity*, (Oxford).
- (1989): *Papyrologica Bruxellensia: Études de papyrologie et éditions de sources*, publiés sous la direction de J. Bingen (Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth) (Bruxelles).
- LINFORTH, I.M.** (1963): *Electra's day in the tragedy of Sophocles*, (Berkeley).
- LLOYD-JONES, H.** (1957): "Literarische griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung", (Hrsg. von Ernst Siegmann, Heidelberg 1956), *Gnomon*, 29: 425-7.

- (1971): *The Justice of Zeus*, Sather Class. Lectures 41 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London).
- (1972): "Pindar *Fr.* 169", *HSCP* 76: 45-56.
- LOBEL, E. (1961) (ed.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XXVI, (London) (no.2450, *frg.*1).
- LORAUX, N. (1986): *The Invention of Athens. The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, London).
- LORD, K.O. (1990): *Pindar in the second and third hymns of Callimachus*, (Diss. Michigan).
- LORIMER, H.L. (1936): "Gold and Ivory in Greek Mythology", in *Greek and Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray*, (Oxford).
- MACLEOD, C.W. (1989) (ed., comm.): *Homer Iliad Book XXIV*, (Cambridge).
- MAEHLER, H. (1963): *Die Auffassung des Dichterberufes im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars*, (*Hypomnemata* 3) (Cöttingen).
- (1982): *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, Erster Teil: Die Siegeslieder, vols.I-II, (*Mnemosyne*, Supplementum 62, repr. in 1997 in one volume) (Leiden).
- (1993): "Die Scholien der Papyri in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Scholiencorpora der Handschriften", in *La Philologie Grecque à l' Époque Hellénistique et Romaine*, (*Fondation Hardt, Entretiens XL*), 95-141.
- MAGIE, A.D. (1950): *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, vols.I-II, (Princeton).
- MARCH, J.R. (1987): *The Creative Poet: studies on the treatment of myths in Greek Poetry*, (*ICS Bulletin Supplement* 49) (London).
- MARKOWSKI, H. (1910): *De Libanio Socratis Defensore*, *Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen* 40 (Breslau).
- MARROU, H.I. (1956): *A History of Education in Antiquity*, (trans. G. Lamb) (London).
- MARTIN, H. (1961): "The concept of Philanthropia in Plutarch's lives", *AJP* 82: 164-175.
- MARTIN, R.P. (1989): *The Language of Heros: Speech Performance in the Iliad*, Cornell University Press, (Ithaca and London).
- MAYASSIS, S. (1957): *Mystères et initiations de l' Égypte ancienne*, (Athènes).
- MCNAMEE, K. (1977): *Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri*, (Diss. Duke University).
- MERKELBACH, R. (1978): "Der Rangstreit der Städte Asiens und die Rede des Aelius Aristides über die Eintracht", *ZPE*. 32: 287-296.
- MESK, J. (1909): *Der Aufbau der XXVI. Rede des Aelius Aristides*, (Lobrede auf Rom) (Vienna).

- (1927): “Zu den proza-und vershymnen des Aelius Aristides”, in *Raccolta di scritti in onore di F. Ramorino*, (Milan), 660-72.
- METTE, H.J.** (1962): “Noch einmal ἀνᾶττει”, *Glotta*, 40: 42-3; repr. in *Kleine Schriften* (Frankfurt a.M. 1988): 200-1.
- MEYER, H.** (1933): *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, (Diss. Köln, Würzburg).
- MICHEL, A.** (1993): “Rhétorique et Philosophie au second siècle ap. J.-C.”, *ANRW* ii. 34.1: 3-78.
- MORESCHINI, C.** (1994): “Elio Aristide tra Retorica e Filosofia”, *ANRW* ii. 32.2: 1234-47.
- MOST, G.W.** (1985): *The measures of praise*, (Göttingen).
- (1986): “Pindar, *O.* 2.83-90”, *C.Q.* n.s. 36: 304-16.
- (1987): “Two Leaden Metaphors in Pindar *P.2*”, *AJP* 108: 569-84.
- MURRAY, P.** (1996): *Plato on Poetry: Ion; Republic 376e-398b9; Republic 395-608b10*, (Cambridge).
- NAGY, G.** (1979): *The Best of the Achaeans*, (Baltimore, London).
- (1990): *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, (Baltimore, London).
- NAOUMIDES, M.** (1961): “The Papyrus of the *Lexicon* of Harpocration”, *TAPhA* 92: 384-88.
- NILSSON, M.P.** (1906): *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung*, (Leipzig).
- (1950): *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*, (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abteilung 5, Teil 2, Band 2).
- NISETICH, F.J.** (1980): *Pindar's Victory Songs*, (Baltimore).
- NORDEN, E.** (1898, 1909, 1958): *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, vols.I-II, (2^{Leipzig} 1898, Stuttgart 1909, 1958).
- NORDEN, E.** (1971): *Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*.4. Aufl., (Darmstadt).
- NÖTHIGER, M.** (1971): *Die Sprache des Stesichorus und des Ibycus*, (Diss. Zürich).
- OLDFATHER, C.H.** (1923): *The Greek Literary Texts from Graeco-Roman Egypt: A Study in the History of Civilisation*, (University of Wisconsin Studies in Social Sciences and History, no. 9) (Madison).
- OLIVER, J.H.** (1953) (ed., trans., comm.): *The Ruling Power: A study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ Through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides*, *TAPhS* 43.4 (Philadelphia).
- (1968): *The Civilizing Power: A Study of the Panathenaic Discourse of Aelius Aristides Against the Background of Literature and Cultural Conflict, with Text, Translation, and Commentary*, *TAPhS* 58.1 (Philadelphia).

- OSTWALD, M.** (1965): "Pindar, ΝΟΜΟΣ, and Heracles", *HSPh* 69: 109-138; (repr. in W.M. Calder III -J. Stern (eds.), *Pindaros und Bakchylides*, [Darmstadt] 1970), 194-231.
- PACK, R.A.** (1947): "Two Sophists and two Emperors", *CP* 42: 17-20.
 ——— (1965): *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt*, second revised and enlarged edition (University of Michigan).
- PAGE, D.L.** (1962): "Pindar: P.Oxy. 2450, fr.1", *PCPhS* 188: 49-51.
 ——— (1981) (ed., comm.): *Further Greek Epigrams*, revised and prepared for publication by R.D. Dawe - J. Diggle, (Cambridge).
 ——— (1987): *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*, (Oxford).
- PASQUALI, G.** (1962): *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, (2Florence).
- PAVESE, C.** (1964): "Pindarica", *Maia* 16: 311-12.
 ——— (1966): "Χρήματα, χρήματ' ἀνὴρ ed il motivo della liberalità nella seconda Isthmia di Pindaro", *QUCC* 2: 103-12.
 ——— (1968): "The New Heracles Poem of Pindar", *HSPh* 72: 47-88.
 ——— (1975/76): "Sul fr.169 di Pindaro", *QTLCG* 3: 63-7.
- PERNOT, L.** (1989): "Aristide", in GOULET, R. (ed.): *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques*, (Paris), 349.
 ——— (1993): La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde grécoromain. (Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité, 137-8), vols.II, (Paris).
- PETERSEN, L.** (1939): *Zur Geschichte der Personifikation in griechischer Dichtung und bildender Kunst*, (Würzburg).
- PETERSON, E.** (1926): *Εἰς Θεός*, (Göttingen).
- PFEIFFER, R.** (1998): *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, (Oxford).
- PHILLIPS, E.D.** (1954): review of OLIVER 1953, in *JRS* 44: 128-9.
- PINI, G.** (1974): "Sul Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς di Pindaro, (fr. 169 Sn.4)", *SIFC* ns 46: 185-210.
- PLEZIA, M.** (1971): "De novo Pindari fragmento Arabico", in *Philomathes. Studies and Essays in the Humanities in Memory of Philip Merlan*, (The Hague), 270-80.
- POETHKE, G.** (1981): "Pindar in der papyrologischen Überlieferung" in E.G. SCHMIDT (ed.), *Aischylos und Pindar. Studien zu Werk und Nachwirkung*, (Berlin), 93-6.
- POHL, K.** (1968): *Die Lehre von den drei Wortfügungsarten*, (Diss. Tübingen).
- POHLENZ, M.** (1948): "ΝΟΜΟΣ", *Philologus*, 97: 139 (= *Kleine Schriften*, vol.II [Berlin 1965], 337).
- PÖHLMANN, W.** (1973): "Die hymnischen All-Prädikationen in *Kol.* I 15-20", *ZNW* 64(1973), pp.53-74.

- PORTER, S.E.** (1997) (ed.): *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*, (Leiden · New York · Köln).
- POWELL, J.E.** (1936) (ed. trans.): *The Rendel Harris Papyri of Woodbrooke College, Birmingham*, (Cambridge).
- PRELLER, L., and ROBERTS, C.** (1887-1926): *Griechische Mythologie*, (Berlin).
- PRIVITERA, G.A.** (1974): *La rete di Afrodite*, (Palermo).
- PUECH, A.** (1923): *Pindare, Isthmiques et fragments*, (Paris).
- (1931): *Pindare, Olympiques*, (Paris).
- RACE, W.H.** (1981): “The End of *Olympia* 2: Pindar and the *Vulgus*”, *CSCA* 12: 251-67.
- (1981): “Pindar's ‘Best is water’: Best of What ?” *GRBS* 22: 119-24.
- (1982): *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*, (Supplements to Mnemosyne no.74: Bibliotheca Classica Batava) (Leiden).
- (1983a): “Two Pindaric passages: *Pyth.* 5.55 and *Pyth.* 10.21-22”. *AJP* 104: 178-88.
- (1983b): “Negative Expressions and Pindaric ποικιλία”, *TAPhA* 113: 95-122.
- (1986): *Pindar*, (Twayne's World Authors Series Greek Literature) (Boston).
- (1987): “Pindaric Encomium and Isocrates' *Evagoras*”, *TAPhA* 117: 131-55.
- (1990): *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's odes*, (American Philological Association, American Classical Studies) (Scholars Press Atlanta, Georgia).
- RADT, S.L.** (1958): *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paeon*, Text, Scholien und Kommentar, (Amsterdam).
- (1985) (ed.) *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: (TrGF)*, vol.3 Aeschylus, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- REARDON, B.P.** (1971): *Courants littéraires grecs des II^e et III^e siècles après J.-C.*, (Paris).
- REIFF, A.** (1956): *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio. Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei der Römern*, Köln.
- RENEHAN, R.** (1969): *Greek Textual Criticism: A Reader*, (Loeb Classical Monographs) (Cambridge, Massachusetts).
- REYNOLDS, L.D., and WILSON, N.G.** (1991): *Scribes & Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek & Latin Literature*, (Oxford).
- RICHARDSON, N.J.** (1985): “Pindar and Later Literary Criticism in Antiquity”, *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar*, 5: 383-401.
- RICKERT, G.A.** (1989): *EKΩN and AKΩN in Early Greek Thought*, (American Philological Association, American Classical Studies) (Scholars Press Atlanta, Georgia).
- ROBERTS, C.H., and SKEAT, T.C.** (1983): *The Birth of the Codex*, (British Academy).
- ROSCHER, W.H.** (1897/1902): “Pan”, *ML* iii. A: 1347-1406.

- (1898): “Über den gegenwärtigen Stand der Forschung auf dem Gebiete der griechischen Mythologie und die Bedeutung des Pan”, *ARW* 1: 43-90.
- ROSENMEYER, T.G. (1962): “Plato's prayer to Pan (*Phaedrus* 279 B8-C3)”, *Hermes*, 90: 34-44.
- RÖSLER, W. (1980): “Die Entdeckung der Fiktionalität in der Antike”, *Poetica*, 12: 283-319.
- RUSSELL, D.A. (1979a): “De imitatione”, in D. WEST and T. WOODMAN (eds.), *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, (Cambridge), 1-16.
- (1979b): “Rhetors at the Wedding”, *PCPhS* 205: 104-17.
- (1990a): “Aristides and the Prose Hymn”, in RUSSELL 1990b: 199-219.
- (1990b) (ed.): *Antonine Literature* (with an introduction by D.A. Russell) (Oxford).
- (1995): *Criticism in Antiquity*, (London).
- and WINTERBOTTOM, M. (1972): *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations*, (Oxford).
- and WILSON, N.G. (1981) (eds.): *Menander Rhetor, On Epideictic Oratory*, (Oxford).
- RUTHERFORD, I. (1995): “The Poetics of the *Paraphthegma*: Aelius Aristides and the *Decorum* of Self-Praise”, in D. INNES, H. HINE, and C. PELLING (eds.), *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*, (Oxford), 193-204.
- SANDYS, J.E. (1961): *The Odes of Pindar*, (21961).
- SCHADEWALDT, W. (1928): *Der Aufbau des pindarischen Epinikion*, SKGG, 5,3, (Halle); repr. Darmstadt 1966, but cited according to original pagination [257-343].
- SCHERING, O. (1917): *Symbola ad Socratis et Socraticorum epistulas explicandas*, (Diss. Greifswald).
- SCHMID, W. (1887-97): *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern*, vols.I-V, Stuttgart 1887-97.
- SCHMID, W. - STAEHLIN, O. - CHRIST, W. (1924): *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abteilung 7, Teil 2, Band 2 (6München).
- SCHROEDER, O. (1917): “ΝΟΜΟΣ Ο ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ”, *Philologus*, 74: 195-204.
- (1922a): *Pindars Pythien*, (Leipzig).
- (1922b): *Pindars Pythien erklärt, Sammlung Wissenschaftlicher Kommentare*, (Leipzig).
- (1923): “Die Religion Pindars”, *NJKA* 51: 129-52.
- SCHRÖDER, S. (1990): *Plutarchs Schrift De Pythiae oraculis: Text, Einleitung und Kommentar*, (Stuttgart).

- SCHULZ, A., and WINTER, E. (1990): "Historisch-archäologische Untersuchungen zum Hadrianstempel in Kyzikos", in E. SCHWERTHEIM (ed.), *Mysische Studien, Asia Minor Studien*, i (Bonn), 33-82.
- SCHÜRER, E. (1909): *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, vols.I-III, (Leipzig).
- SCHWERTHEIM, E. (1987): *Die Inschriften von Hadrianoi und Hadrianeia (IK 33)*, (Bonn).
- SCHWYZER, E. (1977⁵ - 1960²): *Griechische Grammatik*, vols.I-II, (München).
- SEGAL, C. (1974): "Time and the Hero: The myth of *Nemean 1*", *RhM* 117: 29-39.
- (1976): "Pindar, Mimnermus, and the 'Zeus-given Gleam': the End of *Pythian 8*", *QUCC* 22: 71-6.
- SHERWIN-WHITE, A.N. (1973): *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford 1973.
- SHOREY, P. (1933): *What Plato Said*, (Chicago).
- SIEVEKING, W. (1919): *De Aelii Aristidis oratione εις 'Ρώμην*, (Diss. Göttingen).
- SILK, M.S. (1974): *Interaction in Poetic Imagery*, (Cambridge).
- SKIADAS, A.D. (1979-81): *'Αρχαϊκός Λυρισμός*, vols.I-II, (Athens).
- SLATER, W.J. (1969) (ed.): *Lexicon to Pindar*, (Berlin).
- (1971): "Pindar's House", *GRBS* 12: 146-52.
- SMITH, R.W. (1974): *The Art of Rhetoric in Alexandria: its Theory and Practice in the Ancient World*, (Hague).
- SMITH, W. (1867): *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Mythology*, vols.I-III, (London).
- SMYTH, H.W. (1984): *Greek Grammar*, (Harvard).
- SNELL, B. (1937): "Review of the Rendel Harris Papyri of Woodbrooke College, Birmingham, edited with translation and notes by J.E. Powell, Cambridge 1936", *Gnomon*, 13: 577-86.
- (1953): *The Discovery of the Mind: The Greek Origins of European Thought*, Trans. T.G. Rosenmeyer (Oxford).
- (1975): *Die Entdeckung des Geistes: Studien zur Entstehung des europäischen Denkens bei den Griechen*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Göttingen).
- SOHLBERG, D. (1972): "Aelius Aristides und Diogenes von Babylon", *MH* 29: 177-200, 256-77.
- SOKOLOWSKI, F. (1973): "On the new Pergamene *Lex Sacra*", *GRBS* 14: 411-3.
- SPERDUTI, A. (1950): "The divine nature of Poetry in Antiquity", *TAPhA* 81: 209-40.
- STANFORD, W.B. (1942): "The Ending of the Eighth *Pythian*", *CJ* 37: 363-4.
- STEFOS, A. (1975): *Apollon dans Pindare*, (Athens).
- STEINER, D. (1986): *The Crown of Song. Metaphor in Pindar*, (London).
- STEMPLINGER, E. (1912): *Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur*, (Berlin - Leipzig).
- STERNBACH, L. (1935): *Commentationes Horatianae*, (Cracoviae).
- (1963) (ed.): *Gnomologium Vaticanum: e codice Vaticano Graeco 743*, (Berlin).

- STIER, H.E. (1928): "ΝΟΜΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ", *Philologus*, 83: 225-58.
- STONEMAN, R. (1976): "The 'Theban Eagle'.", *C.Q.* n.s. 26: 188-97.
- STRÖMBERG, R. (1954): *Greek Proverbs: A collection of Proverbs and Proverbial phrases which are not listed by the ancient Byzantine Paroemiographers*, (Göteborg).
- SVOBODA, K. (1952): "Les Idées de Pindare sur la Poésie", *Aegyptus* 32: 108-120.
- SWAIN, S. (1996): *Hellenism and Empire, Language Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50-250*, (Oxford).
- SZARMACH, M. (1975): "Le 'Palamède' d' Euripide", *EOS* 63: 249-71.
- TAYLOR, A.E. (1960): *Plato, the Man and his Work*, (London); repr. of 1926 ed.
- THEILER, W. (1965): "Νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς", *MH* 22: 69-80.
- THOMPSON, D' ARCY. (1936): *A Glossary of Greek Birds*, (2Oxford).
- THUMMER, E. (1968): *Die Religiosität Pindars*, *Commentationes Aenipontanae* 13, (Innsbruck).
- (1968-69): *Pindar, Die isthmischen Gedichte*, Textkritisch herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert, vols.I-II, (Heidelberg).
- (1972): "Die zweite Pythische Ode Pindars", *RhM* 115: 293-307.
- TOOHEY, P. (1987): "Shades of Meaning in Pindar, *Pythian* 8, 95-97", *QUCC* n.s.26: 73-87.
- TRAPP, M.B. (1990): "Plato's *Phaedrus* in Second-Century Greek Literature", in RUSSELL 1990b: 141-73.
- TREU, M. (1963): "Νόμος βασιλεύς: alte und neue Probleme", *RhM* 106: 193-214.
- TURNER, E.G.(1965): "Athenians learn to write: Plato's *Protagoras* 326a", *BICS* 12: 67-9.
- (1977): *The Typology of the Early Codex*, (University of Pennsylvania Press).
- TUROLLA, E. (1955): "Σκιᾶς ὄναρ", *Orpheus*, 2: 183-9; (repr. in *Poesia e poeti nell' antico mondo*, [Catania 1956], 86-92).
- UERSCHELS, W. (1962): *Der Dionysoshymnos des Ailios Aristeidēs*, (Diss. Bonn).
- UNNIK, W.C. VAN (1976): *Het Godspredicaat 'het begin en het einde' in Flavius Iosephus en in de Apocalyps van Johannes*, (MKNW, Afd. Lett., N.R. 39,1) (Amsterdam).
- VERDENIUS, W.J. (1983): "The principles of Greek Literary Criticism", *Mnemosyne*, S. iv 36: 14-59.
- (1987): *Commentaries on Pindar: Volume I, Olympian Odes 3, 7, 12, 14*, (Supplements to *Mnemosyne* no.97: *Bibliotheca Classica Batava*) (Leiden).
- (1988): *Commentaries on Pindar: Volume II, Olympian Odes 1, 10, 11, Nemean 11, Isthmian 2*, (Supplements to *Mnemosyne* no.101: *Bibliotheca Classica Batava*) (Leiden-New York-København-Köln).
- VALK M. VAN DER (1958): "On Apollodori *Bibliotheca*", *REG* 71: 100-168.
- VODOKLYS, E.J. (1992): *Blame-Expression in the Epic tradition*, (New York, London).

- VONDELING, J. (1961): *Eranos*, (Groningen).
- WACE, A.J.B. (1948): "Weaving or Embroidery?", *AJA* 53: 51-5.
- and STUBBINGS, F.H. (1962) (eds.): *A Companion to Homer*, (London).
- WALDEN, J.W.H. (1912): *The Universities of Ancient Greece*, (New York).
- WEBB, R. (1997): "Poetry and Rhetoric", in PORTER 1997: 339-369.
- WEBSTER, T.B.L. (1967): *The tragedies of Euripides*, (London).
- (1970) (ed., comm.): *Sophocles Philoctetes*, (Cambridge).
- WEIDEN, M.J.H. VAN DER (1991): *The Dithyrambs of Pindar: Introduction, Text and Commentary*, (Amsterdam).
- WEINREICH, O. (1914): "Typisches und Individuelles in der Religiosität des Ailios Aristeides", *Neue Jahrb. f. das klass. Altertum*, 33: 597-606.
- WERNER, O. (1967): *Pindar. Siegesgesänge und Fragmente*, Hrsg. und übersetzt., (München).
- WEST, M.L. (1966): *Hesiod Thegony: Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*, (Oxford).
- (1973): *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique: Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*, (Stuttgart).
- (1974): *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte, 14 (Berlin).
- (1980): "Iambics in Simonides, Bacchylides and Pindar", *ZPE* 37: 137-55.
- (1989-92): *Iambi et Elegi Graeci Ante Alexandrum Cantati*, Vols. I-II, (Oxford).
- WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, U.VON (1896): *Isyllos von Epidauros*, (Philologische Untersuchungen, 9) (Berlin).
- (1900): "Asianismus und Atticismus", *Hermes*, 35: 1-52 (= *Kleine Schriften*, vol.III [Berlin, 1969], 223-73).
- (1920a): *Platon*, vols.I-II, (Berlin).
- (1920): *Die Ilias und Homer*, (Berlin).
- (1921): *Griechische Verskunst*, (Berlin).
- (1922): *Pindaros*, (Berlin).
- (1925): "Der Rhetor Aristeides", *SB Berl. Acad.*, 28: 333-53. (= *Kleine Schriften*, vol.III [Berlin, 1969], 426-53).
- (1937): "Athena", *Kleine Schriften*, vol.V(2): 36-53.
- (1982): *History of Classical Scholarship*, edited with an introduction and notes by H. Lloyd-Jones, (trans. A. Harris) (London).
- WILLCOCK, M.M. (1976): *A Companion to the Iliad*, Based on the Translation by R. Lattimore, (Chicago, London).
- (1995) (ed., comm.): *Pindar Victory Odes, Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7*, (Cambridge).

WILLIAMS, W. (1976): "Individuality in the Imperial Constitutions: Hadrian and the Antonines", *JRS* 66: 67-83.

WÜNSCH (1914): "Hymnos", *RE* IX.1 (1914), cols. 140-83.

YOUNG, D.C. (1968): *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3, and Olympian 7*, (Supplements to Mnemosyne no.9: Bibliotheca Classica Batava) (Leiden).

——— (1971): *Pindar Isthmian 7: Myth and Exemplar*, (Supplements to Mnemosyne no.15: Bibliotheca Classica Batava) (Leiden).

ZOGRAPHOU-LYRA, G. (1986): 'Ο Μύθος του Παλαμήδη στην 'Αρχαία 'Ελληνική Γραμματεία, (Diss. Ioannina).